

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW  
OF  
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.  
APRIL, 1884.

---

ARTICLE I.

THE EXECUTIVE FACULTY IN MAN.

By PRESIDENT DAVID J. HILL, LL. D., Lewisburg University, Pa.

If the intellectual powers of man affect his knowledge of duty, his executive powers quite as effectually relate to the performance of his duty when it is known. The question of their nature and limitations, therefore, cannot be fairly subordinated to the question of knowledge. Indeed, in the majority of human minds the question of ability to perform, creates more practical doubt and moral hesitation than the question of capacity to know, the will of God. Never before, probably, has a belief in the automatism of all human action been more widely prevalent, or held for reasons apparently so completely unanswerable. The old discussions concerning the freedom of the Will, regarded in the main theological and metaphysical issues, have so little relation to contemporary doubts that they have fallen almost entirely out of fashion, and receive attention only in the provinces, certainly not in the capitals, of current speculation.

An adequate discussion of the executive faculty in man involves its consideration from three points of view: (1) that of subjective analysis, summarizing the facts that lie open to con-

VOL. XIV. No. 2.                      ,    I

sciousness; (2) that of objective observation, bringing into recognition the facts of physics and physiology that bear upon man's activity; and (3) that of logical synthesis, consisting in a statement of the results that logically follow from the facts known in the subjective and objective spheres of inquiry.

#### I. SUBJECTIVE ANALYSIS.

That man has the power to act is not questioned. It is disputed whether or not he can control his acts. This is, in the last analysis, all that is important in the disputes about the Will. We mean by Will the faculty by which the individual controls the other faculties, or the faculty of self-determination. Intellect is knowing power; Will directs it in its activity. Sensibility is feeling power; Will guides and controls the feelings, within certain limits. Will has often been confounded with psychical energy in general, as if it were mere power. It has also been reduced to the mere activity of Intellect and Sensibility. We shall understand by it the faculty of control. It does not belong to this conception to suppose that Will is a distinct entity, a separate sovereign in the soul. It is only one of the ways in which the soul manifests itself. The soul is not the less one because it has the power of self-control.

Fidelity to the psychological method requires us to study Will in consciousness by introspection. This method has not always been pursued, and there is a growing tendency in the physiological school of psychology to disregard it. This disregard has already resulted in the introduction of false analogies and irrelevant facts into the discussion of the phenomena of Will. The question whether or not the soul possesses self-determining power is primarily a psychological question. If consciousness is a trustworthy source of knowledge, it should be trusted here as implicitly as elsewhere. If it is not, it cannot be trusted any where, and all science ends in universal skepticism.

If we analyze the states of consciousness connected with an act of Will, including what immediately precedes and follows it in consciousness, we shall obtain the following results:

- (1). Solicitation. Some impulse to action is first presented

to the soul. This must have some relation to our sensibility or convictions, or it will receive no attention in consciousness sufficient to incite us to action. Supposing an impulse to exist, such, for example, as the prospect of a pleasure-trip, we are conscious of being solicited by it to some definite action, let us say the presentation of a false ground of excuse for absence from duty.

(2). *Deliberation.* Together with this solicitation there comes into consciousness the prospect of dishonor and possible punishment, in case the falsehood is discovered, and the sense of self-condemnation whether it is discovered or not. Now begins the process of deliberation as to whether or not it is better to yield to the solicitation. This involves a long train of considerations, each of which may or may not receive attention.

(3). *Decision.* At length, after much deliberation, or it may be with very little, we reach a conclusion and decide to have the pleasure-trip at the cost of self-respect and the risk of detection and punishment. But the day for action has not yet come, and so the decision is suspended until the time for starting.

(4). *Volition.* On the day when the party starts, the decision, if not reconsidered, is to be realized. The train is ready, the moment of departure is at hand, a moment later and the opportunity will be gone. Still the decision has not become an act and a chance for reconsideration remains. At this instant a determination to go is made, the Will directs the foot to move to the step of the car. The volition is to go.

(5). *Execution.* The mandate of the Will is now received by the members of the body. The psychical act is complete. The volition is beyond recall. Repentance may follow, but it is too late. Our employer is seen standing on the platform watching our departure, but the train is under way, the obedient nerves and muscles have placed the body where it is death to retreat, and a new volition is powerless to change the one that has become an event.

Let us consider these successive stages of a voluntary act a little more in detail.

## SOLICITATION.

The suggestion of a pleasure-trip would produce no effect upon us if there were not in our natures certain forms of feeling containing an element of appetency, or tendency to seek certain objects. Let us designate all these forms of appetitive sensibility by the word "wants". These are the internal elements in our nature that make solicitation effective.

Satisfaction may be had in the form of gratification or relief. Gratification is the affording of positive pleasure. Relief is the removal of pain. In order to influence the soul to voluntary action some promise of gratification or relief must be held out. This is always ideal and related to the future; for, if the satisfaction were real and present, there would be no occasion for willing, and the soul would remain inactive.

Such a prospect of satisfaction is related to action as a final cause, or end. It affords a reason why one should act. As something ideal and future it has no efficiency except through intelligence. In order to be realized, means must be employed to make the ideal and future real and present.

The expectation of satisfaction as the result of action is what we mean by the word "motive." Thus my motive in buying clothing is to keep warm in the future. I may be very comfortable now, and my action is not intended to meet my present necessities. If, to change the case, I am now suffering from cold and procure clothing on that account, the motive is not my present condition, but the prospect of relief from it in the future. Motives are, then, final causes rather than efficient causes. They are the reasons for actions, not the determining forces. Motives suggest effort as the condition necessary for the realization of satisfaction. They are not, however, the efficient causes of effort, for they are not forces at all. They have none of the characteristics of physical or even of psychical force. They are states of consciousness that invite the soul to action but do not determine it.

Motives have been considered by Edwards and others as if they were physical forces impelling the soul to action. Edwards says: "If every act of the will is excited by a motive, then that motive is the cause of the act of the will." And



again: "It is that motive which is the strongest that determines the will." This is to reason as if motives were physical forces, or motors, and to treat the subject as if it were a problem in mechanics to be worked out according to the parallelogram of forces. It is true in physics that a force will follow the line of least resistance, but the determination of the soul cannot fairly be regarded as a problem in physics until motives are assigned a definite quantitative or qualitative valuation. It has not been proved and cannot be proved that a motive, or expectation of satisfaction, has a causative power that can be compared to gravitation or any physical force. Such an ideal state has no physical properties and cannot be reasoned about under physical analogies.

There are, indeed, agencies that do have determining influence. There are physical conditions of life that we cannot annihilate and external forces that are often irresistible. Over these the soul has no direct power of control. There are appetites within us that urge us immediately to their gratification when favorable conditions are presented. This is the "law of the members" which cannot always be resisted. But all these forces lie in the sphere of involuntary action. They are motors, not motives. They are not solicitations to action, they are compulsions. Solicitations within the sphere of conscious volition are appeals to the conscious *self*, as a being possessing *wants*, to realize an *end*, by the use of *means* to be put in combination by an *effort* of the soul.

#### DELIBERATION.

If we examine the contents of consciousness at any moment of time, we find that there are many co-existent elements in the field. Whenever any end is contemplated by the mind as affording possible gratification if realized, there are associated with it other elements of a different character. This complexity of conscious states furnishes the conditions of deliberation.

Beyond all dispute the soul has the power of *attention*, or of concentrating its energies upon a single object or group of objects. This power is possessed in various degrees, according in some measure to the training the mind has received; but all

persons, except the idiotic and the deranged, possess it in some degree. Thus, when a motive is presented and the soul is solicited to action of a particular kind, the power of attention enables the soul to detain the motive for a short time or to pass to something else. If this were the only form of voluntary power possessed by the soul, it would be sufficient to insure some degree of self-determination; for herein lies the secret of action or inaction.

The soul not only possesses the power of simple continued attention; but it also has the power of attending alternately to different objects. This enables it to carry on the process of deliberation upon the materials in the field of consciousness. By this *compound attention* motives may be compared with one another and thus brought into opposition. By compound attention the mind may be even withdrawn from any particular motive and thus destroy its power of solicitation. Thus, for example, a hungry man, seeing bread in a shop window, is tempted to break the glass and secure the bread. The motive here is the prospect of satisfying his hunger. If he at once employs the means to realize this end, he may be taken for a thief. But there is in his consciousness, at the time when the motive to break the glass presents itself, a restraining motive in the form of prospective punishment as a consequence of detection. He can fix his attention upon the restraining motive and thus withdraw it from the motive to break the glass. Other motives will then probably arise in consciousness, as the obligation to obey the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." By this time another method of obtaining bread may present itself, and so the impulse to break the glass and steal the bread will pass away without having become a volition. The element of time thus becomes an important factor in the final determination of the soul. Without this power of attention it appears as if a man would be urged inevitably in the direction of his strongest impulse, but by the power of suspension and delay he can control his actions, so that he finally acts according to his own decision and not according to the passing impulse. The significance of this power of delay has never been adequately estimated in its relation to self-determining power.

The act of deliberation is a complex one. There are three distinct objects that may be made matters of deliberation. These require a separate examination.

(1). We may deliberate concerning the *ends* to be attained. Thus there is a question whether it is better to have the bread and suffer the consequences, or to enjoy safety and an approving conscience and take some other way than theft to obtain the bread.

(2). We may deliberate concerning the *means* to be employed in order to realize the end, when it is decided upon. Here a great variety of combinations may suggest themselves which will have to be balanced and compared.

(3). We may finally deliberate concerning the *time* when the effort is to be put forth to effect the necessary combination of means for the accomplishment of the end.

In these acts of deliberation the Will is exercised in directing the faculties. There is, indeed, a necessary element in these acts, but it is not co-extensive with them. The laws of thought are necessary, the present motives are necessary, in the sense that they are of a given number and character, and many of the relations between the things thought of are necessary. But amid all these necessities, which to a superficial examiner may seem to give the character of necessity to the whole process, here is the self-determining power of attention, simple and compound. Our true freedom lies in this power of attention, and men are free in proportion as they have the power to deliberate. The beings possessing less power of attention than man have a less degree of freedom, because they have less power to suspend action by deliberation.

#### DECISION.

Deliberation involves a series of judgments upon the motives to action presented to the soul. This removes the final determination of the course of action from the sphere of physical cause and effect and brings it into the sphere of psychical action. The original solicitation may have come from a physical source, as for example the sight of the bread in the baker's window; and the final volition to steal may result in a physical action, as the breaking of the window and the taking of the

bread; but intermediate between the solicitation and the theft lie a series of purely psychical actions, some of which contain the self-controlling activity of will in acts of attention. The continuity of physical causation is, therefore, broken, and it is not the original solicitation that determines the final judgment. The conscious *ego* intervenes with directing activity. It is not, then, the strongest motive that prevails, but the soul decides which motive it will follow; that is, it determines the influence of the motive instead of being determined by it. This is more evident in the case of deciding that no motive to action shall prevail, and remaining inactive in spite of motives to action.

In every case there are certain alternatives necessitated by the laws of thought. Thus the law of excluded middle necessitates either action or inaction. When several motives are presented, either all must be ignored, or at least one must be acted on. Between alternatives one must either choose or choose not to choose. Thus there are certain necessary elements entering into every decision. The soul may decide to submit to chance, and thus abnegate its right to rational choice between motives; but this is simply its decision to be determined to action rather than to determine its own action. The boatman on the current of a river may steer his boat or suffer it to drift; but it is a matter of necessity that, being in the current, he must either steer or drift.

A decision to act or not to act is the soul's conscious affirmation of a purpose. It is not a result worked out in the soul by contending forces, but the soul's own conscious purposive determination. When a purpose has been thus formed, it is by no means necessary that it should be at once executed. It may be delayed for a long period. But here again is evidence that the soul determines its own acts instead of being determined by them. If appetites were the determining causes of action, they would produce their effects without delay, inasmuch as being mere blind agencies they would not be able to restrain their own activity. Our experience is, however, that purposes fully formed lie dormant in the soul for long periods, awaiting the opportunity for realization. Here the self-controlling power of the soul, which is precisely what we mean by Will, is necessary to

suspend action until the proper occasion. Nearly all games requiring intelligence in the player involve the art of knowing just when to make a long intended move, or put forth a contemplated effort. The doctrine that the soul is determined by impulses and that it does not control and determine its own activities not only cannot be derived from these facts but leaves them wholly without explanation.

#### VOLITION.

Volition may be defined as a particular act of will. It is the soul's determination of itself. In order to explain its difference from other causes of determination that are sometimes operative, we need to distinguish volition from compulsion, desire and motive.

(1). Volition is not *compulsion*. We are sometimes compelled to act in a given manner. When this is the case our action may be in opposition to our volition. Thus a man is compelled by an officer of the law to go with him to prison. He is taken unwillingly. His volition is not to go. The distinction is evident to consciousness and is known to be real.

(2). Volition is not *desire*. One may will to do that which he does not desire to do. Thus a child may not desire to go to work when he desires to play, yet he wills to do so and opposes his desire by his volition. That to will and to desire are different is evident from the forms of language. Dr. Reid says: "I may desire meat, or drink or ease from pain; but to say that I *will* meat, or drink or ease from pain, is not English." Desire is a state, volition is an act.

(3). Volition is not *motive*. A motive, as we have seen, is the expectation of satisfaction as the result of an action. This cannot be identified with an act of will, for it is the *reason* for the act, and hence exists before it.

We must distinguish between volition and what we have called "execution," or the realization of volition in the world of physical forces. The action of will is psychical action. The execution of the mandates of the will carries us beyond the sphere of consciousness, and if we are to know how they are

executed we must resort to some other source of information. Let us return to the decision to break the baker's window and take the bread. When the convenient moment comes the soul determines that the act shall be *now*. That determination is a volition to act in a determinate manner. The functions of will are now at an end. Beyond this we must trace the act through its physical history. The volition that puts the physical forces in action is known in consciousness to be a personal action. During the actual performance of the act there are sensations of effort in consciousness that indicate the operation of the physical forces. These belong to the sphere of perception, and we have already passed to the limits of the psychological method.

## II. OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION.

Having completed our subjective analysis, we pass to objective observation. This should include an examination of the organic mechanism through which our acts are executed, and the consideration of habit, instinct, cerebration and sleep. We now proceed to these topics.

### THE ORGANIC MECHANISM.

Every act in the world of physical forces is a physical act. The physical forces at the command of the soul are placed at its disposal ready for use in the organic mechanism, or system of bodily organs. This consists of bones, muscles and nerves so combined as to bring the conscious self into relation with the material world. The bones of the skeleton furnish the levers, fulcrums and points of muscular attachment necessary to mechanical effects. The muscles supply connections between these articulated bones and also contain, stored up in their tissues, contractile energy which, when released by the disturbance of its equilibrium, serves to move the bones. The nerves of motion are fibres connecting the sensorium, or termination of the nerves of sensation, with the muscles, and serving to stimulate to action the contractile energy stored up in the latter. Thus the organic mechanism furnishes a system whose forces are ordinarily in equilibrium, but which can be put in motion by volition.

This mechanism is not always at rest, however, when it is not put in motion by volition. Many of its processes are beyond the influence of volition, as for example those of digestion and circulation. Others, as for example respiration, are partly within the sphere of volitional influence. But even the nerves and muscles of voluntary motion are sometimes put in action by causes outside of consciousness. Sometimes such motions take place without any degree of consciousness, as when a sleeping person is tickled on the toe and the foot is moved by the motor nerves without his waking. This is called reflex action. Sometimes the same kind of automatic motion is made when the person is conscious of it but not the voluntary cause of it, as when a person's hand is slyly touched with a pin and is suddenly jerked away. This is known as sensory-motor action. When the motion has a conscious origin in the person's own self-determination, it is called voluntary action.

The soul is conscious of two distinct modes of control over the organic mechanism. These are:

(1). Innervation, or the power to concentrate energy upon a given point. Thus the force of the muscles may be thrown into the hand by an act of volition, so as to give it a stronger grip. The blood may in like manner be thrown into a given part of the body by a simple act of attention by which that particular part occupies the consciousness. The same effect may be produced by the contemplation of mental images associated with some particular part. Thus the power of phantasy reacts upon the body and produces bodily states.

(2). Inhibition. This is the power of arresting actions that usually tend to take place automatically. Thus a patient in a dental operation may have a tendency to cry out and leap from the chair because of the pain of the operation. A strong volition can often prevent both the outcry and the springing from the chair. This power of inhibition is very important in connection with the power of deliberation in postponing action until the impulse that would otherwise be constraining has passed away. Thus the advantages of time and supervening motives can be made available in the determination of action.

There are two classes of limitations of voluntary action fur-



nished by the organic mechanism. There are limitations of structure in the length, strength and articulation of the bones, in the size, fibrous texture and terminal attachments of the muscles, and in the quality and fineness of the nervous centres and connections. There are also limitations of energy. The supply of physical force, both muscular and nervous, is a variable quantity. It is conditioned upon nutrition, health and exercise. There are times when one is stripped of all executive power. This does not prove, however, that man is not a self-determining being within constitutional limits, when in the normal condition.

#### HABIT.

An acquired action is called a "habit." There is provision in our nature for the organization of modes of action so that they become habitual. Repetition renders any act easier than it was at first. This is because lines of least resistance are established by the first and successive actions which, in the growth of the organism, become open avenues for the transmission of impulses. For example, when an arm is moved many times in the same manner, movement in that particular manner is facilitated by disposing the fibres of the nerves and muscles to move in that way rather than in another that would require greater changes in their positions.

There is provision in our nature for the release of intelligence from the lower kinds of occupation for the higher. An infant in learning to walk has to give undivided attention to the guidance of its feet and the management of its limbs. Soon, however, all this is taken up and done automatically by the centres which control locomotion, thus releasing the Intellect for new acquisitions. Two results are thus attained. The Intellect has received training by the performance of the lower and less difficult service, and when thus prepared for it is liberated for a higher employment. Finally the organic mechanism needs only to be set in motion, in order to accomplish the most complex movements, such as writing and playing on musical instruments. The auditory centres so perfectly take up a tune, that we often discover ourselves whistling or humming it without having been conscious of what we are doing. It should not be forgotten, how-



ever, that all complex arts are first acquired through the aid of the Intellect in conscious and voluntary action.

As habits are voluntarily organized, so they may be voluntarily disorganized. As repetition results in the organization of a habit, so the discontinuance of an action after a time results in the disorganization of a habit. Thus a musician out of practice finds it difficult to play once familiar tunes. In all the arts requiring manual dexterity constant practice is necessary. When one has not performed a complicated act for a long time he feels, in the common phrase, that he has lost "the hang of it." The physical fact in such a case probably is, that recent and different actions have effaced the old lines of least resistance in the organism.

As the faculty of control over the Intellect, Will can modify or discontinue most habits, both those of sensibility and those of motor activity. In the case of habits of sensibility, the Will may refuse to permit the Intellect to act in the interest of the habit, and without the aid of the Intellect the habit can not continue. Thus the continuance of the alcohol habit depends upon the gratification of the appetite for alcohol, since if the appetite is not gratified the craving itself will usually disappear. It is not denied that there are cases of dipsomania in which the habit is beyond voluntary cure, but in such a case the victim is not free. If the appetite has been acquired voluntarily, the person is responsible, at least for his irresponsibility.

#### INSTINCT.

The word "habit" should be restricted to those actions which are individually acquired, and for those which are connatural, or belong to our nature as distinguished from our character, we employ the word "instinctive", and the tendency to perform them is called "instinct." This name designates a power that works for ends, but without the consciousness or the volition of the individual. Hence instinct is called "blind" and "unreasoning." Instinctive action is action for an end, but it is the end of the Creator, not of the creature. The apparent intelligence of animals that act wholly from instinct is not intelligence in them, but in their Maker. This is clear from the fact that in-

instincts are operative under circumstances that render them nugatory, as for example when a hen tries to hatch a porcelain egg. It has been endowed with an impulse to incubate as a means for the continuance of its species, but this is wholly beyond its scope of understanding. An instinct differs from an appetite. In the exercise of an appetite there is consciousness of some craving for an object. In the exercise of instinct there is no consciousness of any end whatever. Instinct enables a spider to entrap its prey; appetite impels it to eat it when caught.

Instinct, as an unconscious tendency, belongs to the sphere of involuntary action, and thus affords a limitation to the Will. This, however, does not destroy voluntary action. It merely limits it. As all original instincts are forces in our nature acting for ends important to the individual and the species, they do not require voluntary antagonism, but simply guidance in conformity to moral law. Unless so restrained they become the nuclei of habits that defeat the very ends for which the instincts were implanted.

#### CEREBRATION.

Our communication with the external world is entirely through the nervous system. The sensory nerves bring in impressions from the outer world and the motor nerves carry out volitions for execution. We have seen that the nervous system may act automatically and has a tendency to do so after it has been put in motion by voluntary action. The brain itself, or cerebrum, the great central ganglion through which these forces play, is the scene of intense activity. This is evident from the quantity of blood that goes to nourish it and from the consequences which follow upon its injury. This action of the brain is called "cerebration."

The following will illustrate what is meant by cerebration. The impulses that move the vocal organs in voluntary speech originate in volitions, are conveyed to the muscles by the motor nerves, and then act upon the muscles producing motion and sound. A tendency to do this not completed in outward action is seen when a person reading to himself moves his lips silently. Most persons restrain this outward expression of inward action,

but to what extent? In reading we are usually conscious of a *tendency* to give oral expression to words. Our experience is that of a series of incompleting beginnings. Even in careful thinking we have the same tendency, and in some persons this reaches the point of speaking aloud without the intention of addressing any one. We call this "talking to one's self." In such cases there is beyond a doubt, cerebration, or action in the cells of the cerebrum. This is farther proved by the weariness that follows hard thinking, and its effects upon the vital organs. There is a sense, therefore, in which thought may be described as intra-cranial speech.

Dr. Carpenter and others maintain that cerebration goes on unconsciously, and that the phenomena of somnambulism and hypnotism are explained on this hypothesis. This may be admitted, for it is not impossible that the brain should be capable of reflex action under the law of habit. Unconscious cerebration, however, being automatic, is action of the brain outside of consciousness, and therefore, has the same relation to Will that any other physical habit has. Conscious cerebration, however, is partly under the control of the Will and may be directed. This direction is secured through attention. It is illustrated in every case of recollection. In what manner the conscious soul is connected with cerebral movement and is able to interrupt and change its course is not known. It is as if a pebble were dropped into a stream and the current deflected. In this case the pebble is so dropped that the stream is turned in the direction indicated by volition. Sometimes, however, the stream cannot be so deflected, as when a volition strives to subdue instantaneously a strong emotion. The momentum is too great for the resistance to overcome. Here, as in the stopping of a train, time enters as a factor, and volitions not able to be executed at once may be executed later. Here Will is obstructed, but not rendered nugatory.

SLEEP.

We cannot conclude the treatment of this topic without a reference to sleep, because in that condition of soul and body Will is more or less in abeyance. Sleep is natural or cataleptic. Natural sleep is either dreamless, or dreamful, according to cer-

tain conditions. In dreamless sleep all voluntary activity is interrupted and the soul if not absolutely unconscious, is relatively so. In dreams the soul is conscious of the procession of phantasms produced by cerebration, but is without the power to detain and compare them in a rational manner. The Will is inoperative, although we often have the sense of effort in dreams, and the most horrible tragedies are played in the theatre of consciousness without any ability to interrupt or modify the course of events. We have here a good illustration of what our psychological life would be if we were divested of voluntary power. All the sensations and sentiments known in waking hours are experienced in dreams. Death itself is dreamed of as taking place, and one attends his own funeral.

Trance is a form of cataleptic sleep in which the powers of perception are operative, but the Will is powerless to move the body or give any outward expression. It probably consists in a complete paralysis of the motor nerves.

We have now examined the most important of the external facts that relate to the problem of the executive faculty in man. The main argument of physical determinism is drawn from these data. The defenders of freedom have too frequently ignored them or treated them as having no important relation to the subject. It appears to me that the fatalistic school have reasoned unwarrantably from physical analogies and that the libertarians have unfairly refused to give due consideration to the limitations to freedom presented by the objective world. All must admit that each person, conceding his power of self-determination, is at the same time subjected to limitations of liberty and even actual constraint in action. It is difficult, and perhaps adventurous, to draw this line of demarcation which all must admit exists. Certainly we shall be nearer to the truth if we take into the account all the facts relating to the subject, whether derived by the introspective or the objective method.

### III. LOGICAL SYNTHESIS.

Having indicated the results of subjective analysis and objective observation, we are now prepared to begin the task of combining these results and to ask the question, To what conclu-

sions do they lead? There may be a broad territory between the two regions which we have explored. Further exploration may reveal now unknown facts of great importance. The imagination, too, finds room to disport itself in this *terra incognita*, but the scientific method will not permit us to accept its fancies as equivalent to facts. Excluding all terms of ignorance, and confining ourselves to the positive data afforded by introspection and observation, what is the probable relation between the forces within and the forces without? In the light of all the facts, must we conclude that man's executive faculty is merely a link in an unbroken chain of physical forces; or that, transcending these, it reacts upon the world with a power not wholly conditioned and determined by the physical universe? The first answer is the theory of Necessity, the second is the theory of Liberty. Let us see which can most logically construe the facts and bring them into harmony.

#### NECESSITY.

The theory of Necessity is that all volitions are necessarily caused phenomena, and could not possibly be other than they are, since they are effects of constant forces acting under natural laws. All must agree that volitions are caused phenomena. The theory maintains that every volition is necessary in the sense that a different volition could not possibly take its place. This doctrine is maintained by three different arguments, which we shall consider separately.

(1). The Physiological Argument. The modern doctrine of the correlation and conservation of forces may be stated as follows: There exists a definite quantity of energy whose different modes are correlated and convertible and which is absolutely persistent, being subject neither to increase nor diminution. Whatever happens is caused by some transformation of this definite quantity of force. Applying the theory, sensations and volitions, being phenomena in the organism, are transmutations of this force. Hence all psychical as well as all physical phenomena are necessary effects of pre-existing physical forces. To this doctrine we oppose the following considerations: (a).

The doctrine of the correlation and conservation of forces is not a constitutive truth, but the result of imperfect induction. It cannot, therefore, set aside the facts of consciousness, for it is not certainly true as applied to conscious states. To extend an inductive conclusion from a limited number of physical experiments to all the facts of consciousness, without demonstrating its application to them experimentally, is clearly a *petitio principii*. (b). In reflex action and unconscious cerebration the circuit of sensory and motor forces is complete without consciousness, so that sensation and volition may be left out of the series of effects produced by sensory stimulation without breaking the continuity of the series. If they are effects of these physical forces, as it is claimed, how can the circuit of physical action be complete without them? Sensation and volition seem, therefore, not to abstract force from the physical circuit. (c). Facts of experience contradict the doctrine of physical determination. For example a person is impelled by terrible hunger to steal a loaf of bread. This involves a powerful physical urgency. The whole system craves nourishment. In physiological language, hunger is the craving of thousands of cells in the body sending powerful impulses to the brain. The moral principle, from a physical point of view, is nothing more than a few cells of the gray matter of the brain where moral instruction has been stored up, or possibly nothing but a relation between certain cells. Yet the person does not steal the bread, but perishes with hunger. In this case we can deny neither the physical superiority of hunger nor the conquest of the moral principle in actual instances. How is this explained on the theory of physical necessity? (d). If volition were determined by mechanical forces, as the theory of necessity assumes, action would be the mechanical resultant of the operative forces. A starving man in sight of two equally tempting and equi-distant loaves of bread, according to this theory, could not approach either. The two opposing attractions would exactly balance each other. A person feeling two unequal desires drawing him to two different places at the same time, would necessarily compromise the matter and go to neither; but, as required by the parallelogram

of forces, follow the line of the resultant and go where he did not want to go.

(2). The Speculative Argument. This consists in the application of the law of universal causation to the origination of volitions. If every event has a cause, a volition, being an event, has a cause. This cause, it is affirmed, is a motive. By motives the necessitarian understands the active impulses. Whatever these may be, he says, the strongest will prevail. In explanation, we say: (a). The volition is caused, but not by motives. The law of universal causation is satisfied if we assign as the cause of a volition the self-determination of the soul itself. (b). It is true that some acts are caused directly by appetites and desires, but these are not voluntary acts. There are other acts that we know are not so determined. Some actions are known in consciousness to be determined by the soul itself. But the necessitarian at once demands, what determines the soul to determine as it does? To this we reply that to assume that the soul cannot determine action without being itself determined by forces outside itself, is not to argue but to beg the question. We have the psychological fact on the authority of consciousness that the soul does determine itself. It is conceded by necessitarians that men believe themselves to be free, but it is said they must be mistaken. But if the necessitarian denies the validity of the psychological method and the authority of consciousness, his own position must be abandoned, for how does he know that every event must have a cause? The chain of causes and effects has not been traced between an external solicitation and a volition in any such way as to prove that the solicitation is the cause of the volition. An appeal has to be made to consciousness for the very existence of the motive. How then can the authority of consciousness be denied?

(3). The Theological Argument. This is based on the difficulty of reconciling the self-determining power of the soul and Divine Providence. If the soul does not act necessarily, how can God foreknow how it will act? As we have seen, there are certain necessary elements in every volition. The alternatives between which the choice is made are necessary. It is necessary that one or the other be chosen. A Being wise enough



to know the character of each individual would, then, know how every person would choose. The Omniscient Being knows the characters of men, and therefore can foreknow their actions, without constraining their choice. If there are two roads, one of which a thief would take, and I know that a thief is approaching them, I know which road he will take. He does not take the road he chooses because I know that he will, but because he is a thief.

#### LIBERTY.

The theory of liberty is that the soul possesses the power of controlling its own faculties, and hence of determining its own actions. It does not claim that all acts are self-determined by the soul. It does not deny that some acts are produced by constraining causes. It does not deny that there are always alternatives, one of which must necessarily be chosen. It does not deny the presence and influence of motives. It simply maintains that the soul is free to determine its own acts, within certain limits. The soul might determine the actions of which it is conscious without being free, that is, it might act by its own forces in a manner governed by an inherent and invariable law. This would not be free action. A muscle contains a fund of contractile energy and will respond to stimulation by invariable action. The following are reasons for believing that Will is not a power of this kind: (*a*). Such action is as calculable as any other kind of automatic action. Given a spring of definite elasticity, the power of it may have a mathematical expression and its reaction can be precisely calculated. It is not so with the soul. Its reaction cannot be predicted with certainty. We cannot, therefore, speak of it as acting according to an inherent law. (*b*). For springs and other substances acting under an inherent law there is a fixed unit of force that may be used to measure and compare them. It has never been pretended that the human soul can be brought into comparison with other forces in this way.

The hypothesis of free action is that the soul has the power of self-determination as to which of two alternatives shall be regarded in its actions. Thus, on the one hand, there is the impulse of hunger impelling a person to steal bread; on the other,



there is the moral law by which stealing is prohibited. The theory of free action is that the soul determines which of these alternatives shall prevail in action. The choice between impulses of the lower nature, on the one hand, and the laws of the higher nature, on the other, is a free, that is an unrestrained, choice. The following are the ordinary arguments by which this doctrine is established:

(1). The Argument from Consciousness. This alone, from a psychological point of view, is sufficient. The plain testimony of consciousness cannot be set aside.

(2). The Argument from Language. This is, in reality, an argument from the universal consciousness of man. In all times and lands men have believed themselves to act freely, and this belief has crystallized itself in human speech. All languages contain words expressing the ideas of choice and freedom. Not only the popular speech, but the technical language of law and jurisprudence contains such words, and the ideas expressed by them are essential to the very existence of law and justice.

(3). The Argument from Ethical Emotions. It is a fact of universal experience that certain emotions arise in the soul as the concomitants of obedience or disobedience to what is accepted as moral law. Anthropological research shows that this is universal, or practically so, in the entire human species. Such emotions would be impossible if obedience and disobedience were both necessary. Approval and disapproval both imply freedom as the condition of their existence. Guilt without choice is impossible. Responsibility is commensurate with power. This is, indeed, an ancient argument for the freedom of the soul in willing, but its antiquity only adds to its weight as an approach to a constitutive conception in human nature.

The objections to the libertarian theory are chiefly such as arise from our ignorance, or from our inability to harmonize the facts of consciousness with the facts of objective observation. These objections throw upon the libertarian theory the burden of explaining some of the deepest mysteries of our existence. The necessitarian theory shifts them all by denying them. Contrary to experience, it assumes that mechanical forces and laws prevail universally. But let us see how libertarianism bears its burden.

If we accept the theory of liberty, how can we connect motives, which are without causal energy, with the world of physical forces, which cannot be set in motion except by the action of some force? The difficulty is twofold: on the one hand, there is difficulty in conceiving how the physical world can produce ideal states; and on the other, how ideal states can produce actions in the physical world. There is but one solution. We have seen that in deliberation, decision and volition the conscious *ego* intervenes between solicitation and action. The solicitation ends in the production of motives, that is, in the creation of expectations of satisfaction in the soul. These motives exist as states of the conscious *ego*, but they are not efficient determining states. The *ego* begins its operations in view of these states, and works out its volition. Two conditions are necessarily implied in this: first, that the *ego* has the power of ideation under certain conditions, so that motives are received from the outer world; and second, that the *ego* has the power of self-determination in the presence of motives and of putting in action the executive apparatus. On the receptive side it cannot be said that the *ego* is determined by the presentations of the senses, for they end in ideal states that are without causal efficiency. On the motor side it must be admitted that the *ego* exercises force in putting the executive apparatus into motion, for motion cannot be initiated without force. This force, however, belongs to the *ego* and is within the circle of its own control. The *ego*, then, should not be said to be determined, but to determine. The question arises, Whence this force? It is the same as to ask, Whence the *ego*? This carries us beyond the sphere of our discussion; but, no matter whence, the power of self-determination and man's reaction on the external world are not the less real. But must not this force be replenished? Undoubtedly the force of any finite being in any continued operation must be replenished, but it may be *so* replenished that its determination may be imparted by the *ego*, and is not necessarily already determined when furnished as reinforcement. The assimilation of food increases the energy of a man, but it does not determine the precise manner in which he shall use it when he has received it. That, we hold, depends upon his own determination.

But, in order to react upon the external world, must not the *ego* be something more than ideal, something that can correlate itself to the forces of the physical world? Undoubtedly, but it is not the less self-determining. It derives undifferentiated energy from the physical world, and it receives ideas from the physical world; but this energy does not determine it to specific action, because it is undifferentiated; and the ideas do not, because they are ineffectual phantasms. They are as impotent as shadows. But of what are they the shadows? Of external realities. But do they not exist in the soul? Yes, as ideal states only. If the soul acts, it is in their presence but not by their compulsion, for they are powerless to compel any thing. But do not the realities for which these shadows stand act upon the soul and determine it? Yes, sometimes, but in such cases we do not act freely, and we know that we do not. We speak of ourselves as being "carried away," or "compelled by force of circumstances." But there are times when we are not thus carried away, when we know that the impulse to action is a purely personal one, the initiation of an outward operation by the self-conscious *ego*. This last alone is voluntary action. We cannot act voluntarily without knowing it. Spinoza speaks as if ignorance of the causes of an action is what makes us believe it to be free. The contrary is true. Free actions are those which we know to be initiated by a personal determination. Constrained actions are those of whose cause we are certain that it is *not* a personal determination of ours, though we may be ignorant of what it really is. We sometimes act from instinct, which is a force outside of consciousness, without knowing just what it is that makes us act as we do. We are surprised at our own actions in such cases. We sometimes call this fatality, and say, "I know not what fatality led me on."

But, it may be objected, this view makes the soul itself a force and a force having a particular character. This character must have had a determination from without to render it what it is. Hence all its determinations may be retraced along fixed lines of cause and effect to the causes which produced it and made it what it is, which shows that the soul after all is not self-determined. But can these determinations be thus retraced? It is

true that quantitative determinations can be thus traced out in thought, on the assumption that force is persistent, but we are now in the realm of qualitative differences that may not be traced out in this manner. There may be a qualitative degeneration of the soul that was not necessitated in its original constitution, and may follow, not necessarily, but possibly, from the extent of the power that is given to it. A physical force cannot, indeed, make any aberration, but a force endowed with intelligence, capable of forming purposes and pursuing ends, may neglect those rules of action which alone can guide it safely, and thus come wholly to miss the mark for which it was created. To such a force eternal vigilance would be the price of liberty. If it failed in vigilance, would it be a necessary failure? That depends entirely upon the possession of the power of attention. We have already emphasized the importance of the power of attention in human action. If it is really possessed, *vigilance is possible*, and therefore *neglect is not necessary*. Professor Bain, who cannot be supposed to admit any thing doubtful to a necessitarian, says: "What the Will can do is to fix the attention. As we can, under adequate motive, observe one point in the scene before us, and neglect every thing else; as we can single out one sound and be deaf to the general hum; as we can apply ourselves to the appreciation of one flavor in the midst of many; or be aware of a pressure on a particular part of the body to the neglect of the rest; so in mental attention, we can fix one idea firmly in the view, while others are coming and going unheeded." If this power of attention is an actual possession, it is possible for us to fix the attention upon the rules of reason and the principles of morality, or upon the pleasure of sense and the means of injuring others. According as we do the one or the other, there will result important *qualitative* differences. Whatever, then, may have been the antecedent determinations of the soul, it is clear that they have not been of such a kind as necessarily to determine its action in a particular way. It is true and incontestable that the soul has been determined by powers above itself, but it has plainly been determined to be self-determining.

Our reference to the difference between quantity and quality

in the preceding paragraph may require explanation. So far as the quantity of force is concerned, we feel certain that it can be neither increased nor diminished. It having been imparted to the individual, his power is measured by the amount of it. *Quality*, however, cannot be measured, and hence there is an actual emergence of a new determination of power. To illustrate: It is undoubted that the same amount of force may be employed in shivering a block of marble to atoms or in chiseling it into human form. In the one case we have a mass of *debris*, in the other the immortal Greek Slave. Thus far the law holds that no new force is created and no force is lost. But what influence, that is, what qualitative power, has the mass of *debris* upon the movements of men, to draw them together, or to excite their admiration? Yet the Greek Slave attracts thousands, and will continue to do so for ages to come. Again, the same force may be exercised in pulverizing a mere block of marble or in demolishing the Greek Slave, but what a difference in the effects on the world. Here we see the difference between quality and quantity. Quality requires no physical force to produce it, only the perception of the thing to be done and the direction of power into that channel. The quantity of force never changes, whether that force be exerted in the production of broken marble, or in the production of a sculptured image. Virtue and vice are qualities, not quantities. It requires as much power to steal a dollar from another's pocket as to take it from one's own and give it to a beggar. Granted the intuition of a holy law, the intuition of duty and the power of attention, and we have a moral being. Degeneration would consist in disregarding the law and the obligation, not necessarily in the addition of some new impulse to the soul or the loss of any native power. Under the law of habit, the original powers might become inoperative. The intuition of law might be dimmed and the sense of obligation dulled, and so moral action would become improbable, and at best imperfect. But while the power of attention remained there would be the power to lay hold on the Ariadne's thread that, if patiently and persistently followed, would lead out of the labyrinth in which the soul is lost, to the clearer light and the upper air.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE CALL TO THE MINISTRY: THE PREVALENT AND TRUE THEORIES TESTED.

By F. W. CONRAD, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa.

In an article in the October number of the *QUARTERLY*, (1883), we described the characteristics both of the prevalent and of the true theory of a call to the ministry, and presented arguments to show the unsoundness of the former and the validity of the latter. In the present article we propose to subject them respectively to further scriptural and practical tests, all tending to show that the incorrect views prevalent in the Church, concerning a call to the ministry, constitute the real cause of the inadequacy of the number now entering the sacred office, and that the correction of these erroneous views, and the adoption of sound ones, are indispensable, so to increase the number and improve the character of the ministry, as to render, humanly speaking, the conversion of the world, possible.

The main point at issue between the two theories is, whether God communicates the knowledge of a call by the direct and extraordinary influence of the Holy Spirit, in a special and inexplicable, but nevertheless, in a convincing and reliable manner, or whether he communicates this knowledge through the truths revealed in the Scriptures relative to such a call, and the legitimate effects produced thereby upon the understanding, heart, conscience and will, through the ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit, according to the laws of the human mind.

## THE PREVALENT THEORY AS SET FORTH BY ITS ADVOCATES.

The distinguishing features of the prevalent theory may be learned from the following quotations:

Dr. H. S. Storrs, in his *Lectures on Preaching*, in referring to his relinquishment of the study of the law, and his entry upon that of theology, says: "When my plans of life were changed, under the impulse, as I thought, of God's Spirit, and I had de-

voted myself to the ministry, I determined to fit myself for it, and to preach without reading."

Dr. T. D. Witherspoon, in referring to Saul's preaching Christ, says: "The call of Saul of Tarsus was in many respects extraordinary. \* \* But though the call was thus in its method extraordinary, in essence it was the same that every one must have who would enter upon this office. There must be an impression deeply wrought in the heart by the Spirit of God, that it is our duty to serve him in the ministry, that thus we can best honor him and best fulfil the mission he has given us in the world—a conviction that grows stronger as it is prayerfully deliberated upon and does not yield in prospect of the self-denials and sacrifices which such a life entails."

Bridges, in his *Christian Ministry*, describes the ministerial call, as follows: "The internal call is the voice and power of the Holy Ghost, directing the will and the judgment and conveying personal qualifications. \* \* An inward movement by the Holy Ghost must imply his influence upon the heart, not indeed manifested by any enthusiastic impulse, but enlightening the heart under a deep impression of the worth of souls; constraining the soul by the love of Christ to spend and be spent for him; and directing the conscience to a sober, searching, self-inquiry; to a daily study of the Word; to fervent prayer in reference to this great matter; and to a careful observation of the providential indications of our Master's will."

Bishop Simpson, in his *Lectures on Preaching*, sets forth his views in the following explicit and discriminating manner: "The first evidence of a divine call is in the consciousness of the individual, and is a persuasion which, slight as it may be at first, deepens into an intense conviction that he is called of God to preach the Gospel." \* \* "In its slightest form it (the call) is a persuasion that he who receives it *ought* to preach the Gospel; in its strongest form, that God requires him to do this work at the peril of his soul." \* \* "It is God's voice to the human conscience saying, 'You ought to preach.'" "Admitting the existence of this conviction, how is it known to be of divine origin." \* \* "I think there is nothing unphilosophical in referring it to a purely spiritual source, even to God him-



self." "In this respect it resembles the work of conversion." "Peace springs up in the heart, but whence that peace comes, consciousness alone cannot tell." "Yet the true Christian at once and correctly ascribes it to a divine source." \* \* "That a young man may be truly called of God, but it is impossible for him to know it, except by way of inference from surrounding indications." "This philosophy I believe to be radically defective." "Admitting, however, that this knowledge is not absolute, but merely strongly presumptive, there are other indications which are confirmative." "We are commanded to try the spirits, whether they be of God, and we have tests by which the trial can be made." \* \* "That which is discovered by one, soon becomes manifest to all, and the Church, in whatever way it may operate, opens for him a door-way leading into the ministry." "This call of the Church added to the conscious call, greatly strengthens the conviction of duty."

"Some writers \* \* distinguish between what they term the ordinary and extraordinary call." "In the ordinary call they teach that the young man arrives at the conviction that he should preach, from consideration of his qualifications, mental tendencies and surrounding circumstances; that the same influences lead him to enter the ministry, which, with some changes would have led him to enter the profession of medicine or law, or to have engaged in some secular pursuit." \* \* "So he selects the ministry believing that thereby he can best promote his own happiness and the welfare of humanity."

From a careful examination of the quotations just given, the following points become manifest, and deserve special notice. The phraseology employed in describing the call to the ministry varies, is somewhat vague, and leaves an ambiguous impression on the mind of the reader. No attempt is made to explain intelligently the manner and the means through which the person obtained the knowledge and assurance of the fact that God designed him for the ministry. One of these writers says that the Holy Spirit communicates a knowledge of this call by awakening an *impulse*, another that he accomplishes it by an *impression*, and a third, that he does it by calling forth



a *persuasion*, each of which culminates in a conclusion, that it is his duty to devote himself to the preaching of the Gospel.

Webster defines the meaning and explains the manner in which impulses, impressions and persuasions produce conviction and oblige the conscience, as follows: Impulse, he represents as "a supposed, supernatural influence or motive on the mind." Impression he illustrates thus: "the truths of the Gospel make an impression on the mind." Persuasion, he defines as "arguments or reasons that move the will to determination." Conviction he declares to be "a strong belief or settled opinion, on the ground of satisfactory evidence." These definitions and explanations show, that such impulses, impressions and persuasions, culminating in a conviction of a call to the ministry, can only be produced by the apprehension of such truths contained in the Scriptures, concerning the ministry, as constitute arguments, reasons, or motives, adapted according to the laws of mind, to call it forth in consciousness. And as this rational and scriptural method of communicating the knowledge of a call to the ministry is denied by the advocates of the prevalent theory, there remains no other method, but that of an immediate call of the Holy Spirit, without any medium of communication, which is tantamount to the reception of a direct revelation by inspiration.

In corroboration of the conclusion just drawn, we call attention to the fact, that these writers make no careful discrimination between the direct manner in which Christ made known their call to the apostles, and the apostles to the elders or pastors of the churches, and the indirect manner in which the Holy Spirit now convinces men of their call to the ministry, through the truths pertaining thereto, revealed in the word of God. No passages of Scripture are quoted and no apostolic examples cited in support of the views maintained. And in so far as reference is made to the call of Paul, it is done in such terms as to leave the impression, that every minister in our day is authorized to look for a revelation of his call by the Holy Spirit, as real, immediate and unmistakable as that made by him to Saul of Tarsus, the miraculous circumstances attending it alone excepted.

We are told that this persuasion may at first be very slight in the consciousness of the individual, and that, although it deepens into an intense conviction of his call, it amounts to little more in the end than a strong presumption, which is to be verified by confirmatory tests drawn from the Scriptures. But no such uncertainty attached to the divine call in the Apostolic churches, and this admission of uncertainty as regards the reality of the call in our day, throws the veil of doubt over the sufficiency of the knowledge communicated by the Spirit, and proves that his revelations on this subject have become defective, and cannot now be relied upon with any great degree of certitude.

It is also stated that conscience must impel to the study of the Scriptures, as a confirmation of the inward call, but the Word is not recognized as the instrument of the Spirit in calling it forth. The Church is also mentioned, but her office is represented as that of recognizing and endorsing the judgment of the individual, that he has received a direct call from the Spirit, followed by ordination through her ministers, and subsequently by an election from the laity. But no part is assigned her in calling out those whom she judges to be possessed of the proper natural and spiritual qualifications, to fit them for the office of the ministry.

It is further maintained that a person, in whose consciousness the conviction has arisen, that he is called to the ministry, has the same reason for attributing it to a spiritual source, yea, even to God himself, as the Christian has for believing that the peace which sprang up in his heart at the time of his conversion, was imparted to him by the direct witness of the Spirit. But as the Father bears witness to his existence and attributes through the effects produced in nature, and the Son bore witness to his messiahship through his works, so, does the Spirit bear witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God, through the effects produced on our minds and hearts; in other words, through the work and fruits of the Spirit, as described in the Scriptures, and not by any new and direct revelation made to the soul. And the manner in which the Spirit bears witness of a call to the ministry, is the same, viz., through the truths revealed by him in the word of God.

The prevalent theory, as thus explained by its advocates, lies open to the following objections :

1. It constitutes the individual himself the sole judge of his call to the ministry. He has in some mysterious manner become convinced that he is called to the ministry, and he believes that the fact has been communicated to him by the Holy Spirit. He feels bound by conscience to devote himself to the work of preaching the Gospel. He communicates the intelligence either to his parents, pastor or the education committee, who are expected to accept his judgment and recognize the validity of his call.

2. The age, circumstances and manner in which it is claimed that the knowledge of the call was communicated to the individual, invest it with doubt and uncertainty. It takes place usually at an early age, before his natural talents have been developed by education, and his moral character has been fully tested. He has little or no knowledge of the work and requirements of the ministry, nor of his adaptation, through his natural and spiritual gifts, for its successful prosecution. Neither has he any intelligent apprehension of the means and manner in which the Holy Spirit now begets a conviction of a call to the ministry, but takes it for granted that he received his impressions immediately from the Holy Spirit. A youth of tender age, immature in mind, without a proper knowledge either of himself, the workings of the Spirit or the ministry, without experience and without counsel, decides that God designed him for the ministry, and, as might well be anticipated, mistakes his calling, and proves a failure.

3. No satisfactory evidences are furnished, and no adequate tests can be applied to verify this immediate call. The ministry is the highest of all professions, and imposes the greatest responsibilities. It involves not only the character, usefulness and destiny of the incumbent, but also the interests and salvation of men. No man has a right to assume it without satisfactory evidence, and no one should be invested with it without having been "proved" according to the Scriptures. But such is the nature and source of this call, that it rests upon no other evidence than the testimony of the individual that the Holy

Spirit has revealed to him the fact. No satisfactory proofs can be furnished to substantiate it, and all the tests furnished by the Scriptures as safeguards against the introduction of novices, blind guides, and false prophets into the sacred office, are shut out. Christ himself did not ask men to accredit him as a messenger from God, without appealing to the witness of his character and works; and a theory of the ministerial call that excludes spiritual credentials and scriptural tests, cannot be the true one.

4. The Anabaptists and other enthusiasts of the Reformation period, as well as other religious pretenders in both ancient and modern times, have set up the claim that they had a direct call from the Holy Spirit, that he indited their utterances, and that they had received immediate revelations. While most of the advocates of the prevalent theory would repudiate such extreme pretensions, and some of those mentioned above have uttered express disclaimers against such delusions, it nevertheless remains true that the language they employ in setting forth their views makes the same impression. And their disclaimers, although designed to guard against such an interpretation, simply reveal their inconsistency, and constitute a corroboration of the true theory, extorted from them by the manifest absurdity of such pretentious claims.

5. A man's entrance upon the ministry, according to the prevalent theory, becomes an exception to his selection of any other calling in life, whether secular or ecclesiastical. The selection of some vocation becomes indispensable to all men. In making the choice, the person's adaptations, qualifications and preference must be taken into due consideration. The counsel of parents and the advice of judicious friends are in most cases sought in coming to a final decision. In employing men in any department of business, or in electing them to any office of public trust, their characters and qualifications become the controlling considerations in making the engagement on electing the incumbent. Nor is a different course pursued in ecclesiastical affairs. Any officers that were needed were selected on the ground of their fitness to discharge the duties of the special service called for. Now the theory that lays all these prece-

dents aside, and encourages men to choose the ministry, without taking their natural and spiritual qualifications into consideration as the basis of a just decision—without the judgment of any of the representatives of the Church, through a direct call of the Holy Spirit, is not only at variance with the uniform practice in both secular and religious affairs, but also inconsistent with Scripture precedent and apostolic example.

Nor can we overlook another still more glaring inconsistency into which these writers have fallen. While they object to the rational, logical and scriptural method, according to which the Holy Spirit, by means of the truth, enables an individual to draw the legitimate conclusion, that it is his bounden duty to preach the Gospel, they, nevertheless, admit that the source whence the impulse, impression or persuasion has arisen in the consciousness of a person, is unknown to him, and accept his conclusions, that it must have come from the Holy Spirit, yea, from God himself; and that it must mean that he is called to the ministry, on the *ipse dixit* of the individual, without any reference to his natural or spiritual qualifications, or the application, at the time, of any scriptural tests whatever, as a verification of his inferences, and the validity of his convictions of duty. In other words, they reject the legitimacy of the conclusions, logically drawn from premises furnished by nature, grace and Scripture, and rely upon those drawn from the imagination of the individual himself, unsustained by any other proof.

Further, when God, the Father, testifies that a man is not called to the ministry, by creating him, without those constitutional endowments of mind, heart and speech, indispensable to the successful prosecution of the work of the ministry, it is preposterous to suppose that the Holy Spirit, who knows the mind of God, the Father, to contradict his testimony by bearing witness directly to the same individual, that God has called him to the ministry. And yet the simple statement of an individual, that he has received a call from the Spirit, is credited by the advocates of the prevalent theory, in spite of the notorious fact, that in many cases, such pretensions are unsupported by the testimony of the Spirit, given in the Scriptures, setting forth

the qualifications that those whom he has called must possess, and contradicted by the testimony of God, the Father, as manifested by the deficiency of constitutional endowments.

THE TRUE THEORY EXPLAINED.

The faculties of the soul brought into operation in imparting the knowledge, and producing the conviction of a call to the ministry are the understanding, the heart, the conscience and the will. Through attention, the understanding apprehends truth and accumulates knowledge; through knowledge, thus obtained, the heart is moved and puts forth emotions; through the knowledge and feelings thus excited, the conscience is acted upon by moral considerations and imposes a sense of obligation, and through the combined operation of truth apprehended, desires awakened, and convictions of duty realized, as motive forces, the will is impelled, to form determinations, culminating in corresponding action. These faculties as conferred in creation, cannot in their natural state, by any form or degree of cultivation, develop a true call to the ministry. In order that this may be effected, it becomes indispensable, that these natural faculties be transformed into spiritual graces. This is accomplished by the Holy Spirit through the means of grace, whereby the natural man is begotten of the truth, born of the Spirit, and made a new creature in Christ Jesus. As in producing conviction of sin the Spirit uses the law and in working faith and regenerating the heart, he reveals the things of Christ, in calling forth the conviction of a call to the ministry, he brings into requisition all the truths of Scripture bearing upon the subject. Through this spiritual transformation, the understanding becomes enlightened, the love of God and of man is shed abroad in the heart, the conscience becomes sensitive to moral impressions, a clear conviction of duty ensues, and the high resolve is formed to devote life to the service of God, in the work of the ministry. Correct views are entertained of the glory of God as the ultimate end of life, a deep and abiding interest is felt in the spiritual welfare of man, a conclusion legitimately drawn, that in the ministry, the greatest usefulness could be attained, and a governing purpose formed, so deep and com-

prehensive, as to effect a permanent change in the radical disposition, and rendering the candidate and the minister susceptible to, and interested in, all ethical and religious subjects and ecclesiastical affairs.

The following passages may be quoted as having a direct bearing on the call to the ministry: "Ye are not your own, for we are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's." "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." "Diligent in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." "Son, go work to-day in my vineyard." "Go thou and preach the kingdom of God." The parable of the ten talents; the passages describing the qualifications, duties and promises made to ministers; the directions given by Paul to Timothy and Titus, embracing the tests they were to apply in determining the question of a call to the ministry: the examples furnished, illustrating the truths contained in the passages quoted and referred to together with all the warning against rushing into the ministry unbidden, and all the threatenings declared against hypocrites and false teachers, to whom, as "wandering stars, is reserved the blackness of darkness forever."

Now, as the holy Scriptures contain the whole revealed will of God, and as such are able to make us wise unto salvation;" as all men are warned against "being wise above what is written," as it is enjoined upon all to go "to the law and the testimony" of God for information on all subjects pertaining to life and godliness; as it is declared of those who speak not according to this word, that there is no truth in them, and as all men are forbidden to add to or take from the word of God, it follows that all communications now imparted by the Holy Spirit are made alone through the word of truth. But the doctrine that the Holy Spirit communicates the knowledge of a call to the ministry to all who are designed for it, by an immediate and special revelation, contradicts the position sustained by the passages just quoted, and can no more be established than can the claims of the enthusiasts that they had received a direct call from the Spirit, and spake under an immediate inspiration conferred upon them by God. The views just ex-



pressed constitute the legitimate outgrowth of the doctrine, held by the Mystics, and, in some respects, accepted by the advocates of the prevalent theory of a call to the ministry, namely that the Holy Spirit now makes communications to the mind and heart directly, without the written word, and which necessarily obscures the call to the ministry and envelopes it in the mists of doubt and uncertainty. In referring to this, Dr. H. E. Jacobs, in an article on *The Lutheran Doctrine of the Ministry*, says [*Evangelical Review*]: "Wherever the former mystical theory (of the word) is held, the doctrine of the call to the ministry is obscured. The individual is turned away from the revealed word of God, to search within himself for an undefined inner call. The candidate must declare, that he has been inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to assume the office, whilst but little importance is attached to any test whereby a true, inner call, by the Holy Spirit speaking in the outward words may be distinguished from the vagaries of the individual's fancy."

To the Church the "lively oracles of God are given," and she has become "the pillar and ground of the truth." On her the Holy Spirit has been conferred and the authority given to appoint and commission Christian ministers to preach the Gospel, and administer the Sacraments. Through the word preached, and the Spirit accompanying it, the different truths bearing on the call to the ministry are disseminated, a correct knowledge of the subject is obtained, a deep interest is felt in it, and conscience awakens a sense of obligation concerning it, culminating in a conviction of duty, and moving the will to choose and enter it as a profession for life.

But as the Church is constituted of the ministry and the laity, and all are commanded to become epistles of truth, the obligation to make known the truths concerning the call to the ministry, rests not only upon the clergy, but also upon parents, teachers, church officers and members. And while preaching is the principal agency of imparting the necessary instruction concerning the ministry, the Church is bound to resort to all other instrumentalities of conveying information about it such as personal conversation, epistolary correspondence, the religious press, and permanent literature. As the petition, "Thy



kingdom come," implies and imposes the obligation to do everything necessary to make Christ and his kingdom known in all the earth, so does the prayer, "Lord send forth laborers into thy vineyard," involve the duty of using all the means adapted to induce an adequate number of talented and pious young men to respond to the call of God to enter the ministry. As the expectation that the kingdom of God will come, through the daily repetition of the prayer, "Thy kingdom come," without the use of means, would be a perversion of its true meaning and prove abortive; the same may be said of the expectation that an adequate number of efficient laborers will be called into the world-field of Christ, by the repetition of the prayer, that God would call them forth through the direct influence of his Spirit, without the use of the appropriate means by the Church.

Dr. Phillips Brooks, in his "Lectures on Preaching," emphasizes the duty of exercising greater vigilance, on the part of the Church, in introducing men into the ministry, as follows: "Let us ask then, first, what sort of man a minister should be? It would be good for the Church, if it were a more common question: '*Partly because the motives which lead a young man to the ministry are so personal and spiritual, partly because of our sense of the magnitude and privilege of the work, which makes us fear to be the means of excluding any worthy man from it, partly because, at present, while the harvest is so plenteous, the laborers are so very few—for these and other reasons, there is far too little discrimination in the selection of men who are to preach, and many men find their way into the preacher's office who discover only too late that it is not their place.*'"

In corroboration of the views just expressed, we present the following quotations:

"The certainty of a call to the ministry," says Hollazius, "is derived, not from a new, peculiar and immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit, but from mediate revelation contained in holy Scripture. For Scripture teaches the gift, with which a suitable minister of the Church should be endowed. It also teaches that the Church has the power of entrusting the holy ministry to certain persons. If, therefore, a candidate of theology knows, for the spirit of man knoweth what is in man, that he has been

divinely furnished with those gifts which holy Scripture requires in a minister of the Church, and he sees at hand, before his eyes, a written call from any church, having a right to call, he is certain, without any new and immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit, of his lawful call to the ministry."

Dr. S. S. Schmucker describes the internal call to the ministry as follows: "The conviction of the individual, that God has designed him for this office. This conviction is not at the present day produced in an immediate, extraordinary, or miraculous manner, as in the case of the ancient apostles and prophets. The ordinary evidences of a call are, undoubted piety, at least mediocrity of talent, and a desire, or at least an ultimate willingness to serve God in the ministry, and the coöperation of divine providence by the removal of all insuperable difficulties."—*Popular Theology*.

Dr. H. Ziegler expresses the following views in his "Pastor:—" "The internal call consists in those personal qualifications, which are requisite to the faithful discharge of all the duties of the Christian minister. It is never immediate or supernatural, but always mediate and ordinary."

Vinet in his Homiletics, after maintaining that no extraordinary call, through the direct influence of the Spirit, can now be expected, continues: "Now, as the sensible, direct call from God is wanting, by what can this be supplied? In other words, how may we know that we are called? \* \* The call to the ministry evidences itself, like every other, by natural means under the direction of the word and Spirit of God."

Rev. John Eades, in exhibiting the process of mind through which the conviction of a call to the ministry is produced, says: "All those who are inwardly called of God to the sacred office, have laid to heart the spiritual necessities of their fellow creatures—are willing, ready and desirous, like their blessed Lord, to undertake the work; not from any selfish or worldly motive, but from a principle of glorifying God in the conversion, edification, and salvation of precious and immortal souls."

Dr. C. P. Krauth, in his Theses on the Ministry, distinguishes between the mediate and immediate call as follows: "Calling or vocation is a sacred act, whereby God either immediately by

a direct personal call, or mediately, through the Church, separates and appoints, as seems good to him, certain men to be his co-workers, and stewards of his mysteries. All legitimate calling is either immediate or mediate. We ought not now to expect the immediate calling, either external, by some miraculous act of God, or internal, by some new revelation made to the soul of the person called. But no man should seek the office of the ministry without a persuasion that it is God's will that he should do so. The mediate calling, legitimately made, is no less really divine than the immediate. A legitimate mediate calling is an act whereby men whose fitness for the work of the ministry has been tested and proved, are chosen by Christ, through his Church, to teach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments."

Dr. L. A. Gotwald, in his Holman Lecture on Church Orders, says: "As regards the office of the ministry, as well as all other offices in the Church, these two points from the word of God, are clear, viz., that the endowments or qualifications, which men may possess for these respective offices, are the gifts to them of God, and that these express, both to their possessor, and to others in the Church around him, that the will of God is, that he upon whom he has thus bestowed such gifts, should exercise them also, in the particular office for which he is thus especially fitted. In other words, the divine endowments of a man for the ministerial office constitute essentially the divine call also to that office and the will of God, that a man should be in the office, is expressed by the peculiar fitness which he gives him for it."

The manner in which the conviction of a call to the ministry was called forth by the Church in the case of John Knox and Calvin, against their own misgivings, illustrates the theory maintained in this article. John Knox was endowed with such talents, graces and attainments, that it became manifest to the Church that he was adapted and called to the work of the ministry. He was accordingly frequently solicited in private by his brethren to undertake the work of preaching, but "had persistently refused, on the ground that he had no talent or call to these sacred functions. His friends, however, did not desist

from their purpose, but having consulted with their brethren, came to a resolution without his knowledge, that a call should be publicly given him, in the name of the whole membership, to become one of their ministers. The manner in which this determination was carried out, as stated in McCree's *Life of Knox*, was as follows :

"Accordingly, on a day fixed for the purpose, Rough preached a sermon on the election of ministers, in which he declared the power which a congregation, however small, had over any one in whom they perceived gifts suited to the office, and how dangerous it was for such a person to reject the call of those who desired instruction. Sermon being concluded, the preacher turned to Knox, who was present, and addressed him in these words : 'Brother you shall not be offended, although I speak unto you that which I have in charge, even from all those that are here present, which is this : In the name of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, and in the name of all that presently call you by my mouth, I charge that you refuse not this holy vocation, but as you desire the glory of God, the increase of Christ's kingdom, the edification of your brethren, and the comfort of me, whom you understand well enough to be oppressed by the multitude of labors, that you take the public office and charge of preaching, even as you look to avoid God's heavy displeasure, and desire that he shall multiply his grace unto you.'

"Then addressing himself to the congregation, he said : 'Was not this your charge unto me ? and do ye not approve this vocation ?' They all answered 'It was ; and we approve it.' Overwhelmed by this unexpected and solemn charge, Knox, after an ineffectual attempt to address the audience burst into tears, rushed out of the assembly and shut himself up in his chamber. His countenance and behavior from that day till the day that he was compelled to present himself in the public place of preaching, did sufficiently declare the grief and trouble of his heart," &c.

The case of Calvin corresponds, in all the main points, with that of Knox. He was diffident of his abilities, shrunk from assuming the office of the ministry, and preferred to remain a lay worker. But such were the impressions made upon those

who attended his instructions, that they were convinced that he was called to the ministry, and he yielded to their judgment rather than his own preferences in entering the ministry.

Calvin at Bourges became a teacher both in private conference with inquirers and by discourses in more public assemblies. "Before a year had elapsed," he says, "all who were desirous of a purer doctrine were in the habit of coming to me though a novice and a tyro, for the purpose of learning."

In engaging in such efforts Calvin seems to have yielded to a constraining sense of duty rather than to have followed the bias of his own inclination. "I always preferred the shade and ease and would have sought some hiding place, but this was not permitted, for all my retreats became like public schools."

Neither of these distinguished men claimed that he was led into the ministry by an inner call, but was rather deterred from assuming it, by a consciousness of their deficiencies, as was the case with Moses, Jeremiah and other prophets, and present striking contrasts to those who insist that they have received an inner, direct call from the Spirit, plead that it was accompanied with such a burning desire to preach the Gospel, as to give them no rest until they resolved to engage in it. Bishop Simpson, in his Yale Lectures, maintains that the hesitancy of Knox and Calvin are shared by all who are truly called of God. "There is not an instance," says he, "in Holy Writ, where a true man was ever anxious to bear the divine message. He always shrank from it, hesitated and trembled."

The term *prevalent*, by which we have designated the theory we are combatting, indicates that it has been generally accepted as the true one by the Reformed churches. Bishop Simpson declares that it is the theory of the Universal Church, the correctness of which we question, and over against which, we place the Lutheran theory, as stated in her symbols and maintained by her dogmaticians. The prevalence of the mystical notion of a call to the ministry may be accounted for by the radical tendency among the Puritans in their opposition to Romanism, of running into opposite extremes. Rome so emphasized the "letter" in establishing an outward succession in the ministry,

thereby ignoring the operations of the Spirit in the heart of believers, while the Puritans so emphasized the "Spirit" that they relied upon the Holy Ghost to call out the ministry without the use of the "letter" of the word as disseminated by the Church. The Anglican by accepting episcopacy from the Roman Church became at the same time inoculated with its claim of the transmission of ministerial grace by the Spirit, through the laying on of the hands of the bishops. Accordingly every bishop must declare, as a condition of ordination, that he was moved to take this office upon himself by the Holy Spirit.

Inasmuch as the Lutheran Church has accepted Prelacy, not *jure divino*, but *jure humano*, in Sweden, Denmark and Norway, and has been exposed to Puritanic influences in this country, it would not be strange if mystical tendencies should be developed, even among her ministers. The following may serve as examples. Although Dr. Schmucker assures us that an immediate call in an extraordinary manner is not to be expected now, nevertheless, by stating that the call consists in a conviction of the individual that God has designed him for this office, and that he cannot be absolved from the obligation to persevere in his preparation for it except by insuperable obstacles placed in his way by Providence, he seems to contradict himself, and makes a vague, if not a Puritanic impression. Dr. Ziegler also declares that the call to the ministry is not now direct and extraordinary, and yet he admits that there are special cases which on account of some remarkable spiritual manifestations at their conversion, become exceptions to those who have received the mediate call from the Church, through the ordinary means of grace, and refers to Dr. Cannon, who in his Pastoral Theology says: "The internal call may be accompanied with a power of the Holy Spirit, and attended by circumstances and events in the lives and the conversion of some minister of Christ, which when compared to those of the many, who piously engage in the good service, may appear to be extraordinary." But to guard against the perversion of such cases, he adds: "But let it be observed, that whatever is uncommon in these instances does not belong essentially to the internal call of God."

In regard to the interpretation given to any peculiar manifes-

tations, claimed to have been received from the Holy Spirit at the conversion of an individual, viz, that they indicate that he is called to the ministry, it may suffice to remark that they can not safely be accepted as marks of a call for which others are authorized to look, and do not constitute examples by which others ought to be governed. Extraordinary experiences of this kind are the boast of the enthusiasts, and they no more prove the genuineness of the conversion of the subjects of them, than that they establish the claim of a call to the ministry set up by religious pretenders. And as the pretensions of the latter when subjected to the tests presented by the Scriptures, prove to be unfounded, so, too, are the interpretations of the experiences of the former, when weighed in the balances of the word of God, found wanting.

Dr. H. E. Jacobs, heretofore quoted, says: "All our theologians recognize a true movement of the Holy Spirit on the mind of the individual in leading him, through the study of the outward word, to the conviction that it is his duty to seek the holy office and quotes the testimony of Gerhard, as follows:

"We grant that God, by an inner impulse and inspiration, breathes into some this disposition to undertake the ministry of the Church, without regard to dangers and difficulties to which belongs also that mysterious impulse by which some are drawn to the study of theology. \* \* And if any one desire to apply, in a proper sense, the name of secret call, to these dispositions, both of which are especially worthy of praise, we do not greatly object. Yet, in the meantime, we give the warning, that in order that the doors be not opened to the disturbances of the Anabaptists or the revelations of the enthusiasts, no one, by reason of this secret call, ought to take upon himself the duties of the ministerial office, unless there be added to it the outward and solemn call of the Church." This inner impulse Gerhard afterward declares not to be the call, but "an accident of the same," and a description of the proper disposition or quality in the persons called.

By designating the operations of the Spirit, in convincing a person, through the Word, that it is his duty to preach the Gospel, by the term call, dividing it into an *internal* and *exter-*



nal call, and representing it as constituted of *divine* and *human* factors, as has been done by writers on this subject, it becomes almost impossible, so to distinguish the ordinary call to the ministry now, from the extraordinary call in apostolic times, as to prevent misapprehension and confusion.

Illustrations of this are found in the following examples. Vinet, heretofore quoted, says: "The word call has, when applied to professions of a temporal order, only a figurative signification. \* \* But applied to the ministry the word approaches its proper sense. When *conscience commands, and obliges us to discharge* a certain task, we have that which next to a miracle, merits best the name of a call, and it must be nothing less."

Dr. G. Diehl, (Diet Lecture, 1877), remarks: "God, who called the prophets in ways so manifest, and by speech so distinct, as to produce *absolute certainty* in their convictions, does now, in ways less marvelous, and circumstances less imposing, produce a similar conviction in the mind of every man whose ministry heaven has authenticated." \* \*

The careful reader will observe, that while the advocates of the prevalent theory have employed words and phrases in describing it, that express ideas that accord with the representations made concerning the true theory, and *vice versa*, that some of the words and phrases used by Lutheran theologians, in describing the operations of the Spirit, in begetting a call through the Word, correspond with those employed in setting forth the prevalent or mystical theory. This may be accounted for from several considerations. Striking analogies exist between the two theories. Their respective advocates agree that the agent who imparts the knowledge of a call is the Holy Spirit, that the subject to whom it is communicated is a true believer, a new man in Christ Jesus, and that the form in which it is developed in the consciousness, is that of a conviction, so deep as to bind the conscience and lead to the determination to enter the ministry. The main point of difference between them is whether the Holy Spirit imparts a knowledge of the call directly to the soul, or whether he does it mediately, through the several truths pertaining to the ministry, revealed in the Scriptures, and whether the individual is to determine the question of his call from his

own religious experience, or from self-examination in the light of the Scriptures, the counsel of relatives and Christian friends, and the judgment of the ministers and members of the Church. The subject is a very profound one, involving the manner in which each aspect of truth revealed in the Scriptures concerning the ministry is adapted to effect the several faculties of the soul, and call forth in their combined operations such a conviction of duty, through the super-added influence of the Holy Spirit, as constitutes a call to preach the Gospel, as well as the manner in which the same Spirit communicated the knowledge of a call directly to the apostles and other ministers in the apostolic churches. To set this subject forth in a consistent and scriptural manner, requires the clearest conceptions of every factor that enters into the subject, the most careful and rigid discrimination of the influence exerted and the impressions made by each, and the use of the most terse and forcible terms in describing them. And as such insight, power and discrimination, and felicity of expression, are not the gift of all writers, such discrepancies and deficiencies as we have just noticed, must be looked for in the discussion of all intricate theological points.

But we nevertheless insist that there is no medium ground on which these opposite theories can be fully harmonized by the introduction of a third theory, as a cross between the two. The advocates of the immediate call of the Spirit, according to the prevalent theory, cannot consistently recognize the Scriptures as the test of verifying it, while they reject them as the means of calling it forth; and the advocates of the indirect call of the Spirit, through the truth, cannot consistently admit that, in exceptional cases, the Spirit may now operate directly, independent of the word, in disposing a soul to engage in the work of the ministry, without surrendering the point at issue, and opening the door of admission to the mystics and enthusiasts.

#### DEMITTING THE MINISTRY.

In the Romish hierarchy, the priests constitute a permanent clerical *order*, none of whom is allowed to lay down his priesthood. The Church of England imbibed, with episcopacy, the Romish idea, that a clergyman could not be relieved from

the sacred functions assumed at his ordination, and the British Parliament passed a law declaring that "a priest or deacon could not, and ought not to divest himself of his clerical character." In 1773, Rev. Horne Took divested himself of his clerical robe, studied law, but was refused admission to the bar. He was subsequently elected to Parliament, and although his claim to a seat was at first resisted on the ground that he was still a clergyman, he was afterwards admitted. This case, however, became the occasion of the passage of an act declaring the ineligibility of persons in his situation. The Lutheran Church, regarding the ministry not as a clerical order, but as an office of special service in the Christian Church, maintains that should an individual, under a conviction of duty, be inducted into the ministry, and be afterwards providentially prevented from discharging its duties, he has the right to lay down the office of the ministry, and the body which invested him with it has the authority to relieve him of its obligations, to divest him of its title, and restore him to the position of a layman in the congregation.

This view of the subject is based upon the constitution of the Christian Church, whose members are called to perform various kinds of service in different offices. If now a person be disabled from performing the duties of one office, and be able to perform those of another, he has not only the right, but it becomes his duty, to lay down the one and assume those of the other office. Philip devoted himself at first to the office of a deacon, but afterward relinquished it and became an evangelist. If this had been reversed, he would have had the right, for adequate reasons, to relinquish the office of an evangelist and re-assume that of a deacon, or to become again a layman.

This view of the office of the ministry is a legitimate development of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. Christians constitute a universal priesthood, each one of whom is endowed with talents fitting him for the performance of some particular service, and some of whom are qualified and called to devote themselves to the special work of the ministry. Should any one of the latter discover, after a full trial, that he has missed his calling, or be so disabled that he cannot continue to preach

and administer the sacraments, and that he is able and compelled to engage in some secular pursuit to make a living, he has the right to ask, and it becomes the duty of the ecclesiastical body to which he belongs, to release him from his ordination vows, which he cannot meet, and to allow him to take his place again among the common priesthood, and to perform such service as his gifts, means and circumstances will permit. The Lutheran view of the subject has made such progress in England that Parliament passed a law entitled "The Clerical Disability Act," in 1870, according to whose provisions any minister of the Church of England may resign his preferment, and resume again the position of a layman.

The following incident, narrated by Dr. Thomas Guthrie in his *Sunday Magazine*, must have occurred at the time when this act was under consideration, and comes in point in this discussion :

"In making statements against the retention in the ministry of those who are unfitted for it, at a dinner table where a bishop was present, I was met by one appealing to him how that could be, seeing that every candidate for holy orders, in seeking them, declared himself to be moved by the Holy Ghost? An objection to the bill brought into the House of Lords for allowing clergymen of the English Church to demit their office and loose themselves of their ordination vows, which I met with was this, namely, that such candidates must have been mistaken, since God never calls a man by his Spirit to any office for which he is not fit."

In the United States a similar change of opinion and practice has been inaugurated. About twenty years ago, a Methodist bishop in the South asked to lay down his bishopric, and after a full discussion of the subject, his request was granted by the House of Bishops. Consistency with the views of the Lutheran Church on the call to the ministry, demands that she should, under similar circumstances, take the same course. Accordingly, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, at its annual session in 1870, relieved one of its members of the clerical office, and the East Pennsylvania Synod did the same at its meeting in the fall of the same year. And several similar cases have occurred since.

The right to abdicate the ministerial office ought not, however, to be exercised at random or from caprice, nor granted without good and sufficient reasons. Men called to devote themselves to pursuits cognate to those of the ministry, such as teachers, professors and editors, may consistently continue in the ministerial profession. But when a man, in his youth or the prime of life is disabled from discharging the duties of the ministry, and is necessitated and able to prosecute some secular calling for life, it becomes his duty to ask, and that of the synod to grant him, the privilege of demitting his office. But should a minister not thus disabled, from choice and worldly motives, devote himself to business for life, he would prostitute the holy office, imitate the example of Demas, if not of Judas, and, should he not voluntarily demit the ministry, ought to be divested of its name and functions.

The opposite view is as unreasonable as it is unscriptural. It compels a man to bear a name which becomes a misnomer, and to retain an office, with its solemn responsibilities, whose duties he knows he can never again perform. It exposes him, in some degree at least, among those ignorant of his disability, to the odium that attaches to a clergyman who abandons the ministry for the sake of filthy lucre, and even prevents his highest usefulness as a layman. Hence the ministerial office becomes to him a sinecure, its name an unmeaning sound, its solemn vows a disturber of his conscience, and its ecclesiastical relations and duties a serious inconvenience, if not an oppressive burden.

#### STATISTICS SHOWING THE PRACTICAL WORKING OF BOTH SYSTEMS.

As a tree is known by its fruits, the respective character of the two theories we are contrasting will become manifest by a comparison of their results. The subjoined statistics setting forth the proportion of the number of ministers to the number of the communicants in the Presbyterian, Congregational and Unitarian denominations, as well as those of the Lutheran Church, reveal the legitimate results of both systems, and constitute a practical balance in which they may be duly weighed.

Dr. Herrick Johnson, in his sermon as Moderator of the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, said: "We are

threatened with a famine of the ministry. We have 5,744 churches, and, take every pastor, stated supply, home and foreign missionary now in the field, and there are yet 2,000 churches uncared for. Add all the retired ministers, presidents, professors, teachers, editors, etc., and there are still 601 churches without a shepherd. In the last ten years one-third of the increase in our ministry has been due to accessions from other denominations. We are making less ministers than we made ten years ago. The Church is losing her grip on the Christian colleges as nurseries of ministerial candidates.

"What is the cause of the steadily lessening number of ministerial candidates? It is not the trials of the ministry, nor its inadequate support; not the inducement of brilliant prospects in other callings, nor the intellectual demands made upon the ministry; not the lack of adequate provision on the part of our Church for collegiate education, nor chiefly the lack of general Christian conversation. It is still the same peril I have talked of—the peril of truth's perversion, of losing the spirit in the form."

The *Interior* published Dr. Johnson's sermon, accompanied with the following significant comments and portentous facts and figures:

"We are losing ground. For ten years we have almost every year declined from the record of the preceding year in number of candidates for the ministry.

"Comparing the colleges for the past ten years presents a most discouraging exhibit. The number of graduates is increasing, but steadily the number of those who look toward the ministry is decreasing.

"But the most astounding facts come into view in comparing the number of candidates for the ministry from the different sections of the church. Thus in the southern section, where are the colored churches under the care of the Freedmen's Board, and in the foreign field together, there is one candidate to every two hundred and fifteen communicants; in the western section of the country there is one to every nine hundred and sixty-six; and in the eastern section one to every twelve hundred and fourteen. That is to say, the colored churches and

the foreign mission churches furnish nearly twenty per cent. of the ministers; while in the old Presbyterian centers, with more than a hundred years of Presbyterian history, and a handy supply of the very best schools and colleges, the number of candidates is alarmingly small, and steadily decreasing. Brooklyn Presbytery, with almost twelve thousand communicants, has only two candidates. Erie, with nearly eight thousand, has not one candidate on the way to the ministry; and the whole Synod of Michigan, outside of Detroit, with more than ten thousand communicants, has only one candidate."

A writer in the *Atlantic Monthly*, on "The Decline of Congregationalism," shows that while the population of the United States has increased twelve millions or thirty-three and a third per cent., the Congregational Church has not kept pace with this ratio, having increased only twenty-three per cent., or two and three-tenths per cent. per annum, while some of the other Protestant churches have increased more than twice as much proportionally as the population of this country, and we might add, that in this respect the Lutheran Church excels them all, having increased during the last decade nearly one hundred per cent. And that the proportionate decline in the membership of the Congregational Church indicates a corresponding decline in her candidates for the ministry, is evident from the gradual decrease of their number in the graduating classes of Yale, and the conclusion is that this decline is general as given in the following extract from the *New York Observer*:

"Of eighty-five professors of religion in the last graduating class at Yale—there were in all 149—only five express an intention to study for the ministry. This is a very small number. Does it not indicate on the part of young educated men, a decline of interest in the ministerial profession? It is far below the average of former years, especially the early years of American colleges. We fear that the decline is general, and it is time to ask the reason for it."

Nor is this decrease in the ministry confined to the orthodox churches, but exists in a still greater degree among the Unitarians, as indicated by the following statements made by a candidate for the ministry in Harvard:



"The decrease in the number of students who study for the ministry is very marked. It seems strange that out of so many young men, representing all classes of society, and every shade of belief or unbelief, so few choose the work of advancing the kingdom of God. Nothing can show the steady decrease so forcibly as a few figures. Between 1642 and 1650, 53 per cent. of the graduates entered the ministry. Between 1861 and 1870, 7 per cent. Down to 1701 the per cent. of graduates entering the ministry was 52. In the eighteenth century it was 29 per cent. In the first seven decades of the nineteenth century it was 11 per cent. During the last ten years only 4 per cent. have chosen the profession which we have in view. In my class there were seven out of 177 graduates. Here is a falling off in a ratio of 13 to 1 in two hundred years."

While America is threatened with a famine in the ministry, Germany has been favored with a special ingathering. With the recent revival of orthodoxy and evangelical piety, the number of candidates has greatly increased. In verification of this gratifying fact, we quote the following testimony, taken from the *Sunday-School Times* of July 7th :

"Now when the cry is going up from the theological seminaries of the various denominations in America, that the supply of ministers is falling short of the enlarged demand here, and that even a smaller proportion of college graduates than formerly is entering the ministerial profession, it is encouraging to look away to what has happened in Germany, and what is now happening there. Germany has already passed through that state of spiritual dearth which many are now fearing for this country. There was a time when the cause of Christianity seemed to the fearful to be almost lost in Germany. But within the past few years a change for the better has showed itself. Sunday-schools are spreading ; the cities are being stirred by evangelistic movements ; and the study of theology is once more attracting the more scholarly youth of Germany. Since 1876, the number of theological students in the nine Prussian universities has more than doubled. Great as this increase is, it seems all the greater when compared with the increase in other than the theological faculties. The number of students of philosophy, and of law,

in the Prussian universities, increased last year less than two per cent. each; and of medicine, less than fifteen per cent.; while the students of Roman Catholic theology increased in number nearly ten per cent. and those of Protestant theology more than twenty-one per cent. These figures would certainly seem to show a return towards Christianity on the part of German students; and they certainly mark a new stirring of the spiritual life among the people. If it be true, as has been claimed, that we have latterly taken our fashions in skepticism and in theology from Germany, and that the present relative falling off in the number of theological students is due to the influence of that form of skepticism which is now going to pieces in the country that gave it birth, what may we not look for in the near future, now that Germany is setting us a better fashion in the way in which the higher class of young men are there pressing forward into the ministry of the Christian Church."

The following are the statistics of the Lutheran Church in this country showing the number of candidates for the ministry in her principal Theological Seminaries and Colleges.

GENERAL SYNOD NORTH.

In the eight district synods represented in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg there are 86,039 members. The number of students in the seminary, from these synods, is 26, and from other sections of the Church 11, an aggregate of 37, of whom 17 are beneficiaries. During the last ten years, the average number of theological students entering and leaving the seminary is about 11, an aggregate of 110.

In the regular classes of Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, there are 107 students, of whom 47 are candidates for the ministry, which with 2 in the preparatory department, makes an aggregate of 49.

In the Theological Department of the Missionary Institute, at Selinsgrove, Pa., there are 13 students, of whom 6 receive aid from the Church; and in the Classical Department there are 15 with the ministry in view. The number of ministers sent forth from the institution during the last ten years is 47, of whom 30 were beneficiaries.

The number of communicants in the three synods in the States of New York and New Jersey is 15,139. At Hartwick Seminary, there are 5 students in the theological and 7 in the preparatory department, who intend studying for the ministry. Since 1876, 6 have entered the ministry, and 2 more will complete their course this year.

The number of members in the five synods supporting Wittenberg College is 19,606. The number of students in the theological department of Wittenberg College is 7, and the number sent forth during the last ten years is 60. In the collegiate department there are about 30 students who have resolved to prepare themselves for the ministry, a total of 37.

There are six Lutheran synods in connection with Carthage College, Illinois, containing 9,261 members. During the last ten years, 5 young men from these synods have entered the Lutheran ministry, and 2 that of other denominations, and there were 5 students in Carthage College in 1882-3 who were candidates for the ministry, out of 26 in the classical department, 3 of whom were beneficiaries.

#### GENERAL SYNOD SOUTH.

The General Synod South numbers about 18,000 members. All its district synods are formally pledged to the support of the Theological Seminary at Salem, Va. There are 10 students in the seminary, of whom 8 are beneficiaries. The number of theological students that have entered the seminary, since its removal to Salem, ten years ago, is 54. Of the 100 students in the regular classes of Roanoke College, 13 have the ministry in view. In Newberry College, Newberry, S. C., there are 8 candidates for the ministry out of 25 students in the college classes.

#### GENERAL COUNCIL.

The number of communicants in the General Council is 196,948. There are at present 52 students in the Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. During the last ten years there were graduated from this institution 148, and hospitants (students taking an elective course, but not matriculated), 18. During the last five years the Pennsylvania Synod supported 54 stu-

dents in the Seminary in Philadelphia and 72 in Muhlenberg College, a total of 126—or an average of about 25 a year.

In the regular classes of Muhlenberg College there are 74 students, 39 of whom propose to devote themselves to the ministry. There are also 4 in the preparatory, making 43 in all.

Thiel College Greenville, Pa., has, since its organization thirteen years ago, furnished 25 ministers, and has 12 theological students in the Philadelphia Seminary. There are at present 30 candidates for the ministry in the institution. In the college classes there are 43 young men, 23 of whom are candidates for the ministry, 14 being self-supporting and 9 beneficiaries. There are 12 candidates in the preparatory department, 9 of whom are self-supporting and 3 beneficiaries.

The Swedish Augustana Synod numbers 50,991 communicants. There are in the theological department of Augustana College, at Rock Island, Ill., 35 students, and in the collegiate department there are 80 students, 50 of whom are designed for the ministry. These all are supported by supplies and contributions from the congregations. During the last ten years 103 candidates have been educated and ordained by the synod.

#### INDEPENDENT SYNODS.

The Joint Synod of Ohio has 50,600 members. There are 39 students in its Theological Seminary, at Columbus, O., about two-thirds of whom receive support from the churches, and 90 ministers have been sent forth from it during the last ten years. In Capital University there are 41 students in the college classes, four-fifths of whom have the ministry in view.

The German Synod of Iowa has 25,000 members. There are in the theological department of Mendota College 59 students, all of whom, with rare exceptions, receive aid from the congregations, and 17 in the gymnasium, nearly all of whom are preparing for the study of theology. As the number of candidates for the ministry furnished by the congregations of the synod, is not adequate to provide them with pastors, from six to ten young men, in various stages of preparation for the ministry, in the gymnasia and theological institutions in Germany, are sent to Mendota, where they complete their studies and enter the

mission field of the synod, mostly in the northwest. Nor is this all. The Lutherans in Germany, with whom the Iowa Synod keeps up an ecclesiastical correspondence, not only furnish young men, but also provide the means to sustain them, and one-third of the students in the seminary are supported from the beneficiary treasury of Mecklenburg and the contributions of a few other congregations.

#### THE JOINT SYNOD OF MISSOURI.

The Missouri Synod has 185,000 members. In its principal Theological Seminary, at St. Louis, Mo., there are 105 students, two-thirds of whom are sustained by their parents or friends, one-sixth by the congregations from which they come, and one-sixth from a common beneficiary treasury. At their Pro-Theological Seminary, at Springfield, Ill., there are 184 students. In the Gymnasium (College), at Fort Wayne, Ind., there are about 200 students. In the five Pro-Gymnasias, or College Institutes, there are 114 students, preparing for admission into the Gymnasium, at Fort Wayne. All the students last mentioned, whether pursuing the regular course in college or preparing for it in the collegiate institutes, are, with here and there an exception, preparing for the ministry. In their Teachers' Seminaries, or Normal Schools, there are 156 students, preparing themselves as teachers in the parochial schools of the congregations. These students also study theology to some extent, and are thoroughly drilled in Dietrich's Catechism, the confessions of our church, etc., and are pledged to these confessions in the call extended to them, and are thus fitted to give proper instruction in the catechism, Bible history, and kindred subjects. The summary of these statistics is as follows: Theological students, 289; candidates for the ministry in course of preparation, 314; total, 603; students in Teachers' Seminaries, 156; grand total, 759.

The statistics above given, furnish the data for the following comparative statements, showing that, other things being equal, just in proportion as the true, or Lutheran theory of a call to the ministry, has been adopted, and the Lutheran methods to develop it have been carried out in the family, the parochial school, the catechetical class, and the congregation, in that pro-

portion, has the number of the candidates for the ministry been increased, and just in proportion as the prevalent theory has been adopted, and the Lutheran view and methods abandoned, in that proportion has the number of candidates for the ministry decreased.

The General Synod North has 130,000 communicants, and 168 candidates for the ministry in its institutions, being 1 for every 774 communicants.

The General Council, excluding the Augustana Synod, has 145,957 communicants and 130 candidates, being 1 for every 1,123 communicants.

The Swedish Augustana Synod of the General Council has 50,991 communicants and 85 candidates, being 1 for every 600 communicants.

The General Synod South has 18,000 communicants and 31 candidates, being 1 in every 581.

The Joint Synod of Ohio has 50,600 communicants and 71 candidates, being 1 for every 713.

The German Synod of Iowa has 25,000 communicants and 76 candidates, being 1 for every 330.

The Missouri Synod has 185,000 communicants and 603 candidates, being 1 for every 307 communicants.

The aggregate number of communicants in the synods named above is 605,548, and the number of candidates for the ministry 1,164, or about 1 for every 520 communicants, revealing the fact that the three European Synods—the Swedish Augustana, the German Synod of Iowa, and the Missouri Synod—with 260,991 communicants, have 764 candidates, being 1 for every 342 communicants; and that the American Synods—the General Synods North and South, the General Council and the Joint Synod of Ohio—with 344,557 members, have 400 candidates, or one for every 861 communicants; and that the Missouri Synod, with 185,000 communicants, has more candidates for the ministry than the General Synod North and South, the General Council, the Joint Synod of Ohio, and the German Synod of Iowa combined, with 420,548 communicants.

The following comparative statements of the number of ministers sent out by the Lutheran ecclesiastical bodies mentioned

above, during the last ten years, exhibits about the same relative proportion.

The General Synod North has sent forth from its institutions, during the last ten years, 228 ministers, being one annually for every 5700 communicants.

The General Council, not including the Swedish Augustana Synod, has sent out during the same time 251, being one annually for every 7850.

The Swedish Augustana Synod has sent out 103, being one annually for every 4950.

The General Synod South has sent out 54, being one annually for every 3330.

The Joint Synod of Ohio has sent out 90, being one annually for every 7850.

The German Synod of Iowa has sent out 70, being one annually for every 3570.

The Missouri Synod has sent out about 500, being one annually for every 3700.

In corroboration of the statements just made, we present the following survey of the views and practices, prevalent in the different Lutheran ecclesiastical bodies in the United States.

The General Synod, the oldest of the Lutheran general bodies in America, has generally adopted the prevalent theory, and its practice has been governed by it. Its results in the States of New York and New Jersey, Prof. James Pitcher, Principal of the Classical Department of Hartwick Seminary, describes as follows:

"In 1876-7, there was but one young man from the synods in the states of New York and New Jersey studying for the ministry, and he was in Pennsylvania College, at Gettysburg, and has since taken a theological course and is now in the ministry. In 1878-9 there were 4 students having the ministry in view at Hartwick Seminary; in 1879-80, there were 11; in 1880-81, there were 15; in 1881-2, there were but 12; and this number has been maintained in the last two years. There are at present 3 candidates for the ministry from the State of New York, studying in other literary and theological institutions."



In Pennsylvania and Maryland, Ohio and the adjacent States, under the direct influence of Pennsylvania College and the Theological Seminary, the Missionary Institute and Wittenberg College, the best showing in that body is presented; while in the far West, on the territory of Carthage College, a more discouraging exhibit is made.

In the English and Pennsylvania German churches of the General Council the prevalent theory has also held the sway, but the Lutheran theory is dominant in its German and Scandinavian churches; and while their influence, in this respect, is making itself felt in the English churches, its ministerial statistics indicate a marked and hopeful advance. And in this respect, Thiel College, although but thirteen years old, presents a remarkable ministerial record, which stands in striking contrast with that of Carthage College, only a few years younger.

Scandinavian and German Lutheran bodies in this country have generally not only adopted the Lutheran theory, but also developed it by Lutheran methods. The Swedish Augustana Synod is a fair representative of the views and practices that prevail among the Swedes and Norwegians. Dr. Hasselquist, President of Augustana College and Seminary, Rock Island, Ills., furnished us the data for the following statements.

Among the pious Scandinavian Lutheran families, many parents are desirous that at least one of their sons shall serve the Lord in his vineyard, and when they see such talents in them as would fit them for the ministry, they encourage them to study, in order that they may discover the will of God concerning them. Teachers of the parochial schools pursue a similar course with talented boys, and pastors do the same with their catechumens; and on this wise natural and spiritual traits, constituting the marks of a call to the ministry, are discerned in the boys and nurtured in the young men, culminating in a conviction that they are called to the ministry, and are sent forth approved by parents, teachers and pastors.

Dr. Sigmund Fritschel, President of Mendota College and Seminary, Illinois, gave us an interesting account of the operations of the German Lutheran Synod of Iowa, from which we present the following digest:

It is imposed upon pastors by the synod, as a duty, to look out for talented and pious young men, giving promise of adaptation for the ministry, to confer with their parents on the subject, and to see to it, that they be sent to the College at Mendota. The younger boys of this class are first sent to the Teachers' Seminary, at Beverly, Ia., where they are taught the rudiments of an education, and such as develop the necessary traits of mind and heart, and are then sent to the college and seminary, at Mendota. Pious German Lutheran parents appreciate the ministry, and are gratified when one or more of their sons are deemed worthy to enter it, and such as are able, cheerfully support them during their preparatory studies. The parochial school, with its educated Christian teacher and positive religious instruction in the catechism and the Scriptures, is also brought into requisition, in discovering the elect sons of the congregation and pointing them out to the pastors, who, through a thorough course of catechetical instruction, are able to test both their talents and their piety, and to assist them in coming to a just conclusion concerning their call to the ministry as a profession for life.

The Missouri Synod is the largest and wealthiest among our German ecclesiastical bodies. It has adopted and carried out in the most rigid manner and to the greatest extent the Lutheran theory of the ministry, and both the number and the character of the ministers they are calling out and educating, challenge special attention.

The teachers of the parochial schools have the best opportunity of finding out the most promising boys, and of calling their attention to the work of the ministry. They also confer with their parents on the subject, and encourage them to educate them for the holy office. The general result of this whole system of religious training in the family, the catechetical class and the parochial school, in its bearing on the call to the ministry, is thus described by Rev. H. Walker, pastor of St. John's German Lutheran church, York, Pa., to whose kind offices we are indebted for the statistics heretofore given and the facts stated above. "Although now and then," says he, "a boy does not turn out as well as was expected, and must, therefore, be

dismissed from the institution, yet, as a rule, they come up fully to our expectations and hopes, and, by the grace of God, become well educated, faithful ministers and teachers in church and school."

The subjoined extract from a letter written by Dr. S. A. Re-pass, Professor in the Southern Theological Seminary, after a conversation had with him in Virginia last summer reveals the true state of things in the Southern churches, and abounds with such judicious reflections that we present them as the results of his experience and observation for many years:

The points in the conversation which you desired noted were these: *The small number of young men preparing for the ministry, and the cause of this.* As to the first, I had stated that from one of the largest synods in our Southern Church only one student was in the Seminary at Salem during the past year, and one at Gettysburg; that I could not at that time recall any in our college who were preparing for the holy office; that from another synod there would be no representation the coming session, and perhaps none the session of '84-'85. In another of our synods only one student has been in the seminary here—and none elsewhere—since it was transferred, a period of ten years, although from this same synod come frequent appeals for men. The same might be said, with very few exceptions, of our Church in general in the South. Appalling as these statements are, they apply, according to your own confession, to the Lutheran Church in other portions of the country. In fact, as large a proportion, perhaps somewhat larger, extending the comparison over several years, enter the ministry from our Southern Church as from any of the *English* portion of the Church North. But we can find no comfort in such statistics. Rather does the comparison increase our shame, in view of the fact of the destitution facing us everywhere.

We spoke also of the cause of this state of things. There must be something radically wrong in the system, or the one now in operation is miserably worked. That a congregation fifty or seventy-five years old should in all that time furnish no candidates—and we know of some such—cannot be according to the will of God, except, indeed, we interpret that will as a

judgment. The opinion was confidently expressed that there is and has been most culcable neglect in our pastors in presenting the claims of the ministry upon the Church. The opinion practically obtains that the Church has little to do in the matter apart from authorizing those who apply, or in educating such as make up their minds to the belief that they are called. The view was expressed that the current notion on this subject did not operate healthfully; that it kept out of the ministry some of our best young men; that almost all who enter are dependent upon the Church for help. Whilst not saying aught against beneficiary education, there is certainly something abnormal in the facts as they present themselves, viz., that so very, very few of our ministers come out of our wealthier families. It is wresting the word of God to quote here this, "not many mighty, etc., are called," for there is no Scripture to warrant the conclusion that God has excluded from the privilege and honor of preaching the Gospel those who are able to educate themselves.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The ministerial statistics of the Presbyterian Church, given above, exhibit in an unmistakable manner, that the practical tendency of the prevalent theory is, to decrease the number of the candidates for the ministry, until the supply gives out and famine prevails. That in such a Church, with its intelligence, wealth, institutions, and educative funds, the number of candidates for the ministry could run down to two, in the Presbytery of Brooklyn with twelve thousand communicants, to one in the Synod of Michigan with ten thousand, and to zero in the Presbytery of Erie with eight thousand, proves beyond question, that a theory under whose practical operation such results are possible, cannot be the true one, and must prove disastrous to the Church. And this exhibit becomes the more remarkable, when it is considered, that this threatened famine in the ministry, has occurred in the largest, best equipped and most influential Calvinistic denomination in this country. And as, according to the Calvinistic doctrine of election and grace, God not only determines the individual number of the elect, but also the

means by which they are effectually called and persevere unto salvation, and as the calling of an adequate number of ministers to preach the Gospel, through which every one of the elect must be brought to a saving knowledge of the truth, is indispensable, it would seem that God has either overlooked the pastoral wants of his elect people, by calling so few ministers among them through the direct influence of the Spirit, or else it must be concluded, either that those called did not understand the import of the impulse of the Spirit, or that, understanding it, they all with one consent made excuses, and refused to obey it.

The particularity of the prevalent theory accords, indeed, with the Calvinistic doctrine of a limited atonement and election, according to which the number of the redeemed and elect is comparatively so small, that a correspondingly small number of ministers is needed to preach to them the Gospel, and hence the Spirit, who limits his effectual call to the few elect, confines his direct call to the ministry to the very small number predestinated as the elect ministers of Christ. But it cannot be made to harmonize with the universality of the Lutheran doctrine of the atonement, of the call of the Gospel, of the Spirit, and of the priesthood of all believers, according to which, the Church is bound to call forth and send out an adequate number of ministers to preach the Gospel to every creature, in order that, according to the universal purpose of God's free grace, none should perish, but that all should be brought to repentance and salvation.

The gradual diminution of the number of the ministry in the Presbyterian and other Puritanic denominations, in America, while it may well startle them, is not, when duly considered, at all strange. It is the legitimate outgrowth of the prevalent theory of a call to the ministry. In the natural world no end can be rationally expected and attained, unless the adopted means for its accomplishment are employed in a timely and propitious manner. And the same law has been established in the supernatural world. Conviction of sin, as an end, cannot be expected on the part of the Spirit, the reprover of sin, unless a knowledge of the truth concerning the law, as the means of the Spirit, be made known by the Church. Faith in Christ, as

an end, cannot be reasonably expected, unless the truths concerning the person and work of Christ, as the revealed instrumentality of the Spirit, be proclaimed by the Church. Should the Church fall into the error, that the Spirit would reprove the world of sin, and work faith in Christ directly, without the written word, which he moved the holy men of God to reveal for this very purpose, and consequently neglect to promulgate it, their hopes would be disappointed, and sinners remain in their ignorance and unbelief. And this is just the folly and inconsistency into which these churches have fallen, in adopting and relying upon the prevalent theory for an adequate supply of able and successful ministers, through the direct call of the Spirit, instead of his indirect call, through the dissemination and practical development by the Church of the truths revealed in the Scriptures, and inspired by the Spirit, concerning the qualifications which constitute the infallible mark of his call to the ministry.

The family is the divinely appointed nursery of the ministry. Those called to it are entrusted to parents for their education, religious training, and judicious direction in matters pertaining to their vocation and course of life. But how lamentably is all this overlooked in most of our families! Many parents neglect the education of their children, or trust their religious instruction to others, fail to impress upon their minds the true object of life, refuse to dedicate their gifted sons to the ministry, and instead of urging upon them its claims, rather prejudice them against it. And should any of their sons, under other influences, resolve to study for the ministry, in spite of such inexcusable indifference, fathers not unfrequently refuse to support them and even mothers turn a deaf ear to their entreaties for help. And while they thus withhold their able bodied, strong minded sons from the service of the Lord who made and bought them with his blood, should one of them be possessed of a feeble constitution and a weak mind, they prevail upon him to choose the ministry, as an easy way of making a living.

In the patriarchal age, the first born son, in every family, was set apart as the priest of the household, and in apostolic times, it was believed that sons of some families were called to the

ministry in every Christian congregation, but under the prevailing theory of a call to the ministry, it occurs that, not only in the great majority of families, but in scores of congregations, yea, in whole synods, not a single candidate for the ministry is brought out.

The primitive churches embraced the true theory of a call to the ministry. Accordingly they believed, that an adequate number of men was called not only to supply each congregation with one or more pastors, but also to provide missionaries to go forth, organize and supply other congregations. Under this procedure, inaugurated by Christ and his apostles, Christianity was rapidly made known through Palestine, Asia Minor, Greece and Rome, and but for a departure from it, would long ago have encompassed the habitable globe. Under the opposite theory, it is believed, that in scores of congregations containing many hundreds of talented and pious young men, only here and there one, is called to the ministry, and it is regarded neither as a reproach nor a calamity, that large and wealthy congregations should send forth no candidates for the ministry, during ten, twenty, fifty, years, yea, during their entire history.

Were but the lowest number, namely two, regarded as called by the apostles who ordained "elders," in each of the primitive churches, it would give the General Synod with its thirteen hundred and fifty congregations twenty-seven hundred candidates for the ministry; and the Lutheran Church in this country with its six thousand, three hundred churches, twelve thousand six hundred young men called to the ministry. It would revolutionize its aggressive character, enable it to supply all its destitution at home and take its appropriate position in the prosecution of the work of converting the world.

Parents on presenting their children to God obligate themselves to bring them up in the *faith* in which they were baptized, in other words, they solemnly covenanted with God to give them a Christian education. The necessity and importance of establishing parochial schools by Christian congregations, and the duty of parents to see to it that their children receive a thorough religious training in them, are both involved in Infant Baptism. In Europe full provision is made in this respect,



and the parochial school was brought by our fathers to America, and their establishment was enjoined by constitutional provision upon every Lutheran congregation. A school-house became a necessary appendage to every church. The Scandinavian and the Germans, as we have seen, encourage their congregations to establish and support parochial schools. The English Lutheran churches, and a goodly number of the Pennsylvania German Lutheran congregations, have given up the parochial, and availed themselves of the common schools, as their substitute. But the best of these schools, in which the Bible is still read, the Lord's Prayer repeated, and Christian hymns sung, are so deficient in positive religious instructions, that they cannot possibly give a child even a general religious training, and those schools from which the Bible has been excluded cannot be styled Christian in any proper sense. The inconsistency of the Church, in turning her baptized children over to the State, which can give little more than a secular education, instead of providing religious schools herself, and giving them a positively Christian education, must be apparent to all. And the superficial notion, that our Sunday-schools constitute an adequate substitute for the common school, and that scarce an hour's religious instruction on Sunday can make up for its neglect during all its school hours in the week, is proven to be deceptive by the opinions and conduct of the children educated in these schools. And the practical effect of the parochial and the common school systems on the number and character of our ministry, the reader will see by a comparison of the statistics furnished by each as given heretofore.

The pulpit should not only be the guardian, but the efficient propagator of the ministry. Its opportunities and advantages for presenting, at proper times and in all manner of forms, the truths concerning the call, character, service and blessed results of the work of the ministry, and of urging its claims upon young men, and its due appreciation upon all church members are so numerous and great, that the expectation would naturally be cherished, that they would do full justice to their own office. But under the demoralizing influence of the prevalent theory of

a call to the ministry, its incumbents fold their hands and wait for the Spirit to give the call, instead of looking out for the marks of the call, in the talents and graces conferred, and of making intelligent efforts to convince the young men possessing them that they are called, and ought to devote themselves to the ministry. And we question whether one of our ministers in fifty has ever preached on the call to the ministry, and urged its claims from the Lutheran standpoint.

The repeated and various forms in which the religious press is adapted to present the Church and her service, the ministry and its claims, Christian nurture in the family, religious training in the school, the value of a sanctified literature, and the achievements made in the mission field of the world, render it the most powerful agency, and efficient assistant to parents, teachers, church officers and pastors, in disseminating religious intelligence, calculated to awaken attention to the office of the ministry, to exhibit its true characteristics, to incite efforts on its behalf, and to induce many young men to choose it as their profession for life. But so illiterate and penurious are many of our church members, that they can neither appreciate the character, nor estimate the value of a first-class church paper to themselves and their households, and as a consequence not more than one family out of four or five, and not more than one member in fifteen or twenty, can be induced to take the *Observer*. In these families the door is barred to all religious intelligence, and as the parents know little or nothing about the Church and her work, they take little or no interest in it, and as the sons read nothing about the ministry, and hear nothing but complaining and disparaging criticisms of their pastor, they lose all respect for the office and never entertain even a thought, that the talents and graces conferred upon them, would enable them to render God service in the ministry and that it is their duty to prepare for and prosecute it as their life work.

That God has not discriminated in favor of the sons of the wealthy, to the disparagement of those of the poor, in conferring constitutional and gracious endowments, and that he has, consequently, called many poor as well as rich young men into the ministry, needs no proof. That all such require both liter-

ary and theological culture for the successful prosecution of its work is equally apparent. The necessity of providing the means for the education of indigent, talented, and pious young men, becomes consequently, manifest, and the duty of contributing to this cause to such a degree that no worthy candidate possessing the evident marks of God's call imprinted upon his intellectual, physical and moral constitution need be rejected.

Notwithstanding this, the contributions of the churches have been for many years inadequate to educate the acceptable candidates presenting themselves, under the operation of the prevalent theory of a call to the ministry, to say nothing of the scores and hundreds of young men, endowed with the necessary qualifications, who might have been brought out by proper efforts, and educated for the ministry, according to the true theory, if the means had been provided. But so large has been the number of beneficiaries, who proved failures, on account of their improprieties in conduct as students, deficiency of intellect, blemishes of character, slowness of speech, and lack of common sense, as to bring the whole system into disrepute, in spite of the large numbers, educated by the Church, who have proven themselves worthy and successful ministers of Christ. In the discussion of the subject, thus called forth, some have suggested that the Church should provide for the education of large numbers of her young men, and then select those possessed of the requisite abilities, and endeavor to convince them of their call to the ministry. Others have maintained, that the temptations held out to young men to choose the ministry as a means of obtaining an education and bettering their chances for life, are so strong and the number of those who failed to refund the money advanced them for their education, after they had become able to do it, so great, that this plan had better be abandoned as found wanting.

Two years ago, the Pennsylvania Synod abandoned the system of beneficiary education, as such, and now only advances money to such as need and apply for assistance, taking their notes, without interest, and relying upon their honor to refund the sums loaned, after they enter the ministry. The result, thus far, has been, that the number of applicants has been

greatly reduced, an illustration of which is found in the five candidates of the Freshman class of Muhlenberg College, not one of whom has applied for aid and all of whom support themselves. But so long as the Church fails to select her candidates, according to the marks of a call pointed out by the Scriptures, and waits until those claiming to have received a direct call from the Spirit, offer themselves, these failures will be repeated, in spite of any other expedients that may be adopted, and the discrepancy between the number of the laborers and the extent of the harvest continue.

Self-protection has compelled the churches, in a measure, at least, to discredit the reliability of the direct call, and by subjecting all applicants for aid, to a preparatory course of training at their own expense, adequate to fit them for College, and without which, as a practical test, they cannot be received on the funds of the synod, the result of which has been, that the number of applicants has been considerably reduced. For example, in the East Pennsylvania Synod, with 13,616 communicants, there was but one candidate for the ministry, who applied for assistance. There was, consequently a balance of more than \$2,200 in the beneficiary treasury, awaiting applicants, and no assessment was, accordingly made for beneficiary education in 1883-4. And when it is recollected that this synod includes the cities of Philadelphia, Lancaster, Harrisburg, Pottsville, Reading, Allentown, and Easton, the outlook for the supply of ministers is not reassuring. And although the above requirement was a step in the right direction, the system cannot be relieved of all defects, until the true theory of a call to the ministry be restored, and the Church select her candidates, instead of accepting those who offer themselves, footing the bills, and taking all the risk.

The beneficiary system, in its practical results, has not only made itself liable to objections such as have just been referred to, but it has become the occasion of a wide spread impression that the Church must get her candidates for the ministry from the families of the poor and educate them at her expense, while the majority of families of the wealthy refuse, on this account, to induce their talented and pious sons to devote themselves

to the ministry, and educate them rather for any other profession. In corroboration of these statements, we present the following statistics, showing what proportion of the students in our theological, and of the candidates in our literary institutions, come from our wealthy families and support themselves, and what proportion are drawn from the families of the poor, and are supported by the Church.

Ten years ago, the startling fact was stated to us by Dr. J. A. Brown, that there was not a single theological student in the seminary at Gettysburg, who was supported by his parents or friends, and that all were beneficiaries. It is matter of gratification that a marked improvement has taken place in this respect since that time. Of the 37 theological students now at Gettysburg, 20 are supported by their parents, and 17 are beneficiaries. Of 49 candidates for the ministry in Pennsylvania College, 25 are beneficiaries. Of 13 theological students at the Missionary Institute, 7 are self-supported, and 6 receive aid from the churches. Of 15 candidates in the classical department 10 support themselves and 5 are beneficiaries. Of 7 students in the theological department of Wittenberg College, 3 support themselves and 4 are beneficiaries, and of 30 candidates in the college 15 are self-supported, and 15 are beneficiaries. In Carthage College of the 5 candidates for the ministry, 2 are self-supported and 3 are beneficiaries. In the German Theological Seminary at Chicago, 7 students are reported, all of whom receive assistance from the Church. At Hartwick Seminary, of 12 candidates for the ministry, one-half are supposed to be self-supporting and one-half beneficiaries. [Estimated.] Of 52 theological students in the Philadelphia Seminary, 32 are self-supported, and 20 are sustained by different synods. Of 43 candidates in Muhlenberg College, 23 are supported by themselves, and about 20 by the synods. In Thiel College, out of 35 candidates for the ministry, 23 are self-supporting, and 12 beneficiaries. In Augustana Seminary, at Rock Island, there are 36 theological students, and in the college about 50 candidates, all of whom are supported by the churches, but pay their own tuition. Of 10 theological students in the Seminary at Salem, Va., but 2 are self-supported and 8 are beneficiaries. Of 13 candidates for the

ministry in Roanoke College, 4 are self-supported, and 9 receive aid from the Church and the college. In Newberry College, S. C., there are 8 candidates, 5 of whom are self-supported, and 3 are beneficiaries. Of 59 theological students in the Mendota Seminary, and 17 candidates for the ministry in the Gymnasium of the German Synod of Iowa, hardly any are supported by their parents, and nearly all are sustained by the churches. Of 39 students in the Seminary at Columbus, O., 13 are self-supported, and 26 are beneficiaries, and of 45 candidates for the ministry in Capital University, 17 are self-supported, and 31 are assisted by the Synod of Ohio. Of 105 theological students in the Concordia Seminary, at St. Louis, about two-thirds, or 70, are self-supported, and one-third, or 35, assisted by the churches, and of 184 theological students in the Pro-Seminary at Springfield, Ill., about two-thirds or 192 support themselves, and one-third or 97 are supported by the churches, and of 200 candidates for the ministry in the Gymnasium at Fort Wayne, and 114 in the Pro-Gymnasia about one-half, or 157 are self-supported, and the other half, or 157, are supported by congregations, and the general beneficiary fund. Total, 349 who educate themselves, and 254 who are educated by the Missouri Synod.

The following summary exhibits the proportion of the theological students in the seminaries, and the candidates for the ministry in the colleges who are supported by their parents and those who are sustained by the Church in the several ecclesiastical bodies mentioned above. In the institutions of the General Synod (North) of 173, 87 are self-supporting, and 86 are beneficiaries. In those of the General Council—not including the Swedish Augustana Synod—of 120 students, 78 are self-supporting, and 52 are beneficiaries. In the Swedish Augustana Synod there are 85 theological students and candidates all of whom are supported by the churches—their tuition excepted. In those of the General Synod (South) of 31 candidates for the ministry, 11 are self-supported and 20 are beneficiaries. In those of the Joint Synod of Ohio, there are 87 candidates of whom 30 are self-supported and 57 beneficiaries. In those of the German Synod of Iowa there are 76 candidates, nearly all of whom are supported by the churches. And of 603 candidates for the

ministry in the institutions of the Missouri Synod 349 support themselves and 254 are sustained by congregations and the general beneficiary treasury.

Revivals of religion have marked the development of the Church in America. They consist of the simultaneous conversion of many persons, under the appropriate use of the appointed means of grace. And although unscriptural methods have been resorted to in promoting them, and spurious religious excitements have abounded, genuine revivals constitute the promised seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and their fruits, tried by the tests of Scripture, will compare favorably with those gathered through the regular preaching of the word and the instructions of the youth in the catechetical class. The bearing of revivals of religion cannot therefore be overlooked in the discussion of our subject.

In revivals many persons are converted in a comparatively short period of time, a due proportion of whom are young men. The first impulses of the new born soul are characterized by benevolence, prompting to usefulness. The claims of the ministry are frequently presented, at such times, in various forms by ministers and others, and the question of highest usefulness decided by many in its favor.

This is especially the case in college revivals, where the subjects are all young men, most of whom have not yet determined, in the light of conscience and the word of God, what their life-work shall be. It was our privilege to preach series of discourses, five times to the students of Pennsylvania, three times to those of Wittenberg, and once to those of Roanoke College, in which about three hundred young men turned unto the Lord, more than one hundred of whom devoted themselves to the ministry, and the majority of them are still alive and doing good service in the cause of Christ. The examples cited by Prof. Tyler in his Prize Essay on Prayer for Colleges, prove beyond all cavil the importance and value of college revivals, in replenishing the ranks of the ministry.

Ministers, as spiritual fathers and the religious teachers of the people, render them the most useful and valuable service, and deserve at their hands the highest consideration. Accordingly



the Scriptures enjoin upon all the members of the Church to esteem their pastors very highly, to receive "with meekness the ingrafted word," to submit to their rule in the Lord, to coöperate with them in every good word and work, and to pray for, and to render them a just and adequate support. And while the performance of each of these duties will add something to the comfort and usefulness of a pastor, the combined result of obeying them all will be to invest the ministerial office with its legitimate functions, rights and emoluments, and exhibit it in its true and scriptural light. Just in proportion as this is done, will the office of the ministry appear desirable and attractive to young men, and just in proportion as the ministry is regarded with disrespect, its counsels unheeded, its authority despised, and its support stinted, will the office appear repulsive and young men be deterred from entering it. When such unjustifiable burdens are added to the ordinary privations and trials of the ministry, it is not to be wondered at that the office must go begging, and that the great majority of thoughtful young men can without compunction of conscience disregard the command of Christ: "Son, go work to day in my vineyard." And as the prosperity of the Church depends upon the number and character of her ministers, their proper treatment or their cruel neglect become important factors in determining the measure of the supply and the extent of the deficiency in the ranks of the ministry. And a proper regard for or disregard of the ministers affects God himself, who, while he promises to call an adequate number of laborers into the harvest, on condition, involving the proper treatment of his servants, he on the other hand threatens to remove the candlesticks from the churches that refuse to hear, honor and maintain his messengers, as the lights of the world.

The bearing of the inadequacy of ministerial support, upon the supply of the ministry, is so direct and telling, that we cannot forbear calling attention to it. God made ample provision for the maintainance of the priests and the levites, and Christ declared that the laborer was worthy of his hire, and that those who preach the Gospel should live from the Gospel. And yet, so little are the principle and command of Christ heeded by the

churches, that the great majority of ministers obtain an inadequate support, and but few receive such salaries as to be able to provide for themselves and families during their active service, as well as when disabled by sickness and the infirmities of age. And the effect of this injustice, and consequent want and suffering, upon parents and their gifted sons is such, that fathers are tempted to dissuade their sons from choosing, and the sons from considering the claims of the ministry.

The following extract from the letter of Dr. John Hall, called out by the threatened famine of the ministry in the Presbyterian Church, is strikingly in point here :

"We are a people growing in wealth more rapidly than any other. We have our largest church served by a ministry with an average income of about \$500 a year. We have thrown away the principle and the burdens of an "establishment," and we have a clergy in whose straits and privations the writer of touching columns finds the readiest material for rousing cheap sympathy.

"We in the religious world are lamenting—I had almost said whining—over a deficient supply of candidates for the ministry, and we are making things artificially and unhealthily easy for such as come ; and side by side with our joy over ten millions of communicants is the pitiful tale of domestic distress and pinching poverty in the homes of those who minister to these millions.

We invite the sons of such men as can educate their boys at their own cost, as physicians, lawyers, artists, engineers, sometimes sending them to Europe for greater advantages—we invite them to the ministry, practically telling them in our literature and our life that we shall reckon closely the minimum on which they can live, and "retire" them without pension when they have passed their prime. And we wonder that they do not come to our seminaries. We may tell them, indeed, that the disciple has to take up his cross ; but the average American youth has sense enough to know that ministers are not specially singled out for the cross ; that it is for all ; and that it is possible to serve God faithfully without being in the ministry. And

so they stay away, and we have to adopt exceptional methods to draw good and educated men into this profession."

Of the same tenor are the following remarks made by Dr. Thomas Guthrie :

"The calamity which I stand in dread of, and which is next to the withdrawal of the divine blessing, the greatest a church can suffer, is that the rising talent, genius, and energy of our country may leave the ministry of the Gospel for other professions. 'A scandalous maintenance,' Matthew Henry says, 'makes a scandalous ministry.' And I will give you another equally true. 'The poverty of the parsonage will develop itself in the poverty of the pulpit.' I have no doubt about it. Genteel poverty, to which some ministers are doomed, is one of the great evils under the sun. To place a man in circumstances where he is expected to be generous and hospitable, to open his hand as wide as his heart to the poor, to give his family good education, to bring them up in what is called genteel life, and to deny him the means of doing so is enough, but for the hope of heaven, to embitter existence.

"In the dread of debt, in many daily mortifications, in harassing fears what will become of his wife and children when his head lies in the grave, a man of cultivated mind and delicate sensibilities has trials to bear more painful than the privations of the poor. It is a bitter cup, and my heart bleeds for brethren who have never told their sorrows, concealing under their cloak the fox that gnaws at their vitals."

In natural husbandry, the forces of nature must be brought into contact with the germ or life force in order to secure germination, growth and fructification. And analogy requires the same procedure in spiritual husbandry. In order that the Spirit may call a soul into the kingdom of God, through a supernatural begetment and spiritual birth, it becomes indispensable that the truth, as the incorruptible seed of regeneration be brought, by the Church, in contact with the mind, heart, conscience and will in the formation of a new creature in Christ Jesus. For the Church to expect such results, by the direct inward illumination of the Spirit, without the written word, as the enthusiasts maintain, would prove a delusion and a snare

and fill her folds with hypocrites and fanatics. Notwithstanding the number and character of the passages, pertaining to the call, qualifications and work of the ministry, contained in the Scriptures, their adaptation so to impress the faculties of the soul as to develop the conviction of a call to the ministry, and the corresponding practice of Christ and the apostles in calling out those who bore the marks of a call, and setting them to work in the kingdom of God, the Church in this country, under the influence of the prevalent theory, has settled down into a state of indifference in regard to the call to and supply of the ministry. Scarcely any interest is taken in the subject, and little or no sense of obligation is felt by any one, to make an intelligent effort to impart information and to endeavor to convince any talented and pious young man of his call to the ministry.

All the agencies of the Church, which ought to be brought into requisition in bringing the truths concerning the call to the ministry, its qualifications and work, in contact with the minds and hearts of young men, are derelict in duty and greatly at fault. In most households God is not recognized at the family altar, and the claims of the ministry are shut out from the consideration of the baptized sons of the Church. In the congregation the prayer: "Lord send forth laborers into thy harvest," is seldom if ever heard in a prayer meeting or in the pulpit; no elder, deacon or member thinks that he has anything to do with looking out for the marks of a call to the ministry in young men, and very few of the largest and wealthiest congregations contribute enough money to sustain regularly even *one* candidate for the ministry. The Sunday-school teacher becomes the substitute of the parents in imparting religious instruction, and the Common School and the State University take the place of the parochial school and the Christian College, in the education of the sons of many church members, and from neither do they ever hear a word about the office of the ministry, and their obligations in regard to it. In the pulpit, discourses on the call to the ministry are seldom, and in many never heard, and all references to it are so tinctured with mystical representations about the call of the Spirit, that no Scrip-

tural impression is made thereby, either on parents, young men, church officers or members. And the church paper, however highly it might be freighted with instruction on the call to and work of the ministry is voluntarily shut out of tens of thousands of the homes of professed church members, and whose sons never receive a ray of light on this great subject. And while the foregoing presents a glance at the negative side of the subject, its positive side must not be overlooked. Beneficiary Education, by perversion from its true design, becomes the means of drawing an undue proportion of the sons of poor families into the ministry, and the occasion to the rich to withhold an undue proportion of their sons from the ministry, so that not one of our wealthy and cultured families in a hundred, yea, scarce one in a thousand, has a representative in the ministry of the Church. So great has the dread of spurious revivals, with their unscriptural methods become, that no prayers are offered and intelligent efforts made to promote genuine ones, and thus these prolific sources of ministerial supply have been cut off. And so inconsiderate and unkind has the treatment of the ministry been on the part of many congregations, so inadequate the salaries paid them, and so onerous the trials and sorrows to which they and their families have been subjected, that the ministerial office, high and noble as it is, has been divested of its true attractions, and is shunned rather than chosen by many gifted and thoughtful young men. In a word, under the demoralizing influence of the prevalent theory, the ministry receives little consideration anywhere, and is ruled out almost everywhere. The relative merits of the prevalent and true theories of a call to the ministry are not thoroughly discussed in our theological seminaries, and our ministers are sent out, either with no definite views on the subject, or with mystical and un-Lutheran proclivities. The professors in our colleges and the teachers in our classical preparatory schools, who possess the best opportunities for discovering such gifts of mind, heart and speech, as give promise of adaptation for, and indicate a call to the ministry, do not avail themselves of them, and students, after years of daily intercourse, pass from under their care, without having been spoken to on the subject of the ministry, or its

claims as a profession for life urged upon them. And education committees have given so much weight to the account given them by applicants for aid, of the time, place, circumstances and manner in which the Holy Spirit called them to the ministry, that they accept them without demanding such other corroborative evidences as the Spirit requires those to furnish, whom he has called, according to his own testimony given in the Scriptures. And so much veneration have they for this mystic call of the Spirit, and so much do they stand in dread of keeping one of God's elect out of the ministry, that they continue applicants on the funds from year to year, whose deficiencies of talents, grace and gifts of speech, have become notorious among their class-mates and fellow-students, if not to their teachers in the college and their professors in the seminary. Furthermore, the prevalent theory has paralyzed all the springs of intelligent effort in calling out the elect sons of God into the ministry of the Church, while she has folded her hands, and watched with complacent inactivity for a larger increase in the number of ministers, through the mystic call of the Holy Spirit. The question concerning the call and supply of the ministry has been taken out of the department of the origination and use of adapted means for the attainment of spiritual and ecclesiastical ends, and removed to the sphere of inspiration and of mysticism, in which enthusiasts are engaged in endeavoring to discover by dreamy introspection, the inner call to the ministry. It ought not, therefore, to awaken surprise, that so few of the pious and gifted young men of the Church have entered the ministry, but rather excite wonder that so many have devoted themselves to it; that so large a proportion of them have by their ability, fidelity and success, given full proof of their ministry, and received the divine seal of the legitimacy of their call and investiture of the sacred office.

#### APPEAL TO THE ELECT YOUNG MEN OF THE CHURCH.

Redemption presents the greatest of all subjects, the Bible is the most wonderful revelation, and the ministry the first of all professions. Its great theme is "Christ and him crucified." Its special work the moral recovery of man. Its ultimate end the

salvation of a lost world. Its Exemplar was Jesus Christ. It has been graced by prophets and apostles. To its service illustrious men "of whom the world was not worthy," have devoted their lives. In its prosecution martyrs have died. And among its supernatural associates, angelic messengers as ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation, are found.

The Church is "the pillar and ground of the truth," the bearer of the redemption powers, designed to recover to holiness and happiness a ruined world. The Lutheran Church constitutes the most numerous Protestant branch. Her origin marks the greatest era of modern history, and her ecclesiastical achievements stamp her with renown. Reorganized after the model of the apostolic and primitive Church, her distinguishing characteristics doctrinal, liturgical, governmental and ceremonial, place her midway between ecclesiastical extremes, and, in their combination and consistent development, constitutes her a great and glorious Church. And the service to which she calls her sons is, therefore, at once, the most interesting, useful, happyfying and ennobling, and the field of labor to which she invites them in America, is wider in extent, richer in material, and more promising in results, than that opened to the sons of any other denomination in this land. God by creation has conferred upon hundreds and thousands of the young men in the Lutheran Church, the natural talents, by Redemption, the spiritual graces, and by Providence, furnished the means and opportunity to prepare themselves for the work of the ministry. The considerations presented to them in this article, prove that the question of vocation must be determined by highest usefulness, and as the ministry stands unrivaled in this respect, those endowed with the necessary qualifications, bear the marks of the call to the ministry, and are morally bound to devote themselves to it. Upon the conscience of all such, we lay, with mountain weight, the call of the Lord of Glory to enter the great harvest, and assist in gathering it into the garner of heaven.

Let them not magnify its labors and trials, nor overestimate its difficulties, but let them study its claims, until, with Paul, they are constrained to cry out, "Necessity is laid upon me, yea, woe is me if I preach not the Gospel." Let them not consult



with flesh and blood, but respond to the Master's call, prepare thoroughly for his work, prosecute it with fidelity and perseverance, bear hardness as good soldiers of the cross, and they will enjoy the approbation of conscience, the esteem of men, and the favor of God. And, finally, after a triumphant death, they will be recognized and greeted, at the general resurrection, as the deliverers of those whom they were instrumental in bringing to the knowledge of the truth; and in presenting them as the trophies of their ministerial labors, each one may exultingly exclaim: "Here, Lord, am I, and children that thou hast given me," to which he will respond: "Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." "They that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST.

Translated from *Quenstedt's Systema Theologicum*, by REV. PROF. J. W. RICHARD, A. M., York, Pa.

Ἀδύνατον γάρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας γευσάμενους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ καλὸν γευσάμενους θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν ὕλον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.—Heb. 6 : 4, 5, 6.

"For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and *then* fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

Ἐκουσίως γάρ ἁμαρτανοντων ἡμῶν μετὰ το λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται

θυσία, φοβερα δέ τις ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως καὶ πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθι-  
ειν μέλλοντος τοῦ ὑπεναντίου. Heb. 10 : 26, 27.

"For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sin, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries."

Observe, (I.) In this passage (with which agrees chap. 10 : 26, 27, 28), the author is not speaking of the sins in general which men commit after baptism, whether knowingly or ignorantly, as the Novatians, Cathari and their followers formerly contended, who sought to justify their error from this text, (Heb. 6 : 4, 5, 6), teaching, according to Epiphanius and Ambrose, "*That all who after they have received baptism, have denied the doctrine of Christ through fear of persecution, can no more obtain pardon or remission of their sins;*" or that they do not have access to repentance, through which they may be restored and obtain the pardon of sins.

The Apostle is not speaking of sin or denial in general, but in particular, of malicious wickedness and blasphemy joined with final impenitence, or of the special Sin which is called the sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. For he speaks, 1. Of that sin by which the Spirit of Grace is treated with contempt, as is evident from the parallel passage, Heb. 10 : 29. 2. Of that which ἐκουσιως μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, has been committed *wilfully* after receiving a knowledge of the truth, Heb. 10 : 26. 3. Of the sin which is distinct from sin committed against the law of God in the case of a depraved life and character, Heb. 10 : 28. 4. Of that which is κατ' ἐξοχὴν, a *falling* (*prolapsus*), v. 6, viz., against light, v. 5, and the knowledge of divine truth, Heb. 10 : 26. 5. Of that by which the Son of God is crucified afresh, v. 6, and exposed to an open shame, v. 6, and trodden under foot, Heb. 10 : 29. 6. Finally, of that sin by which the blood of the covenant is counted an unholy thing, Heb. 10 : 29. Therefore the Apostle is speaking of the sin against the Holy Ghost. This is the view of Athanasius, and of the papists Titelman, Bellarmin, and Gagnejus.

Observe, (II.) We must consider here 1. The *Subject* of the Proposition, or those of whom the Apostle is speaking, v. 4, 5.

2. The *Predicate*, or what he says of those persons, v. 6. The *Subject*, or the persons who commit this sin, are accurately described by the Apostle; for (1.) he calls those who commit the sin against the Holy Ghost *φωτισθέντας*, that is, he says they were first enlightened by the knowledge of the Christian doctrine. By this enlightening (*illuminatio*) the early Greek and Latin Fathers both understand *baptism*, and explain "once enlightened," by *baptized*; because the Greek Fathers say *φωτίζειν* instead of *baptizare*, and called *Baptisma Φωτισμα* and also the sacrament of illumination. But more correctly do our theologians understand 'enlightening' in this passage as simply the illumination of the mind, so that the *φωτισθέντες* are those who have been enlightened by the knowledge of revealed truth, since in the parallel, it (*φοτισμός*) is explained by *τὸ λαβεῖν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας*, Heb. 10 : 26. But *φοτισμός*, or illumination, is either *pedagogic*, merely literal and external, as when any one is instructed in the doctrine of divine truth, and convinced in his own conscience of the certainty thereof, but does not yet have this known truth sealed upon his heart by the seal of the Spirit, or does not have the gracious indwelling of the Holy Spirit confirmed; or, it is *spiritual*, *gracious and internal*, as when any one *truly renewed*, has not only an external knowledge of evangelical truth, but at the same time is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which the Holy Ghost himself graciously inhabits; or as when the truth is not only known and apprehended, but at the same time is strengthened, confirmed and sealed by the internal witness of the Holy Ghost graciously dwelling in the heart.

Meisner has maintained that the literal and external knowledge of the truth is sufficient to constitute one a sinner against the Holy Ghost, even without a spiritual apprehension or gracious sealing of the truth; and hence as he shows from the case of Pharaoh and the Pharisees those not renewed, provided they have been instructed in divine truth, may be held guilty of the sin against the Holy Ghost. But in regard to Pharaoh, the cause is doubtful. The Pharisees, however, cannot be regarded as unrenewed, because by the word and the circumcision which

they had received, then the legitimate means of regeneration, they had been regenerated. It is evident, moreover, that they had a knowledge of divine truth; if from no other source, at least from their office and from the seat of Moses, to which even Christ sent his hearers, Matt. 23 : 2, 3. "We know," οἶδαμεν, says Nicodemus ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν φαρισαίων, John 3 : 1, speaking in his own name and in that of his colleagues, "we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles except God be with him." Therefore we hold with Gerhard, Hutter, Baldwin, Hulsemann, Dorsch and other theologians, that the *Subject*, or the persons committing the sin against the Holy Ghost, are those only who have been truly regenerated, justified and renewed; and we prove it *a.* from antecedent passages, where it is said that they are "partakers of the heavenly calling," Heb. 3 : 1, that they are "the house of Christ," v. 6, "partakers of him," v. 14, are distinguished from unbelievers, Heb. 4 : 2, "believers," v. 3; *b.* from the *text itself*, where (1) they are called φωτισθέντες, that is enlightened with a spiritual illumination sealed by the gracious indwelling of the Holy Ghost. φωτισμὸς ἐστὶν κριτήριον renatorum, says Dorsch, and is opposed to blinding, 2 Cor. 4 : 4, 6, is connected with awakening, Eph. 5 : 14, and is the spiritual opening of the eyes, Acts 26 : 18.

We come next to ἅπαξ, *once*. In this passage, according to Glassius, Philolo. Sac., it denotes a complete and all-sufficient illumination. *Who once*, that is, *finally, completely, most truly*, not κατὰ δόξαν, *are enlightened by a temporary, although none the less a truly saving faith*. The word ἅπαξ, says Dorsch, is not only a mark of unity, but also of verity; compare 1 Pet. 3 : 20, "When once," ἅπαξ, "the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah," which does not so much mean *waited a single time*, (semel), as *waited* with earnestness and sincerity. So Jude 3, "The faith which was once," ἅπαξ, "delivered to the saints," that is, not so much *delivered a single time* (semel), as, *fully and sincerely delivered, perfecte et sincere tradita*; and in v. 5, the Apostle means that we should *once*, ἅπαξ, remember the examples of God's vengeance against the Israelites in the wilderness, against the apostate angels, against Sodom and Go-

morrah; where he does not so much mean that we should remember it *once* (semel) as distinctly and fully remember it, and once for all. Compare, Ps. 89 : 36, where Jehovah says, "Once have I sworn by my righteousness," that is, *absolutely and unchangeably*. γ. This is also evident from what follows, where it is said, (2). that *they have tasted the heavenly gift*. To taste, τὸ γεύεσθαι, is not in this passage equivalent to tasting with the tips of the lips only, after the manner of cup-bearers, but it denotes distinct perception, as elsewhere γεύεσθαι θανάτου, to taste death, means to have a distinct perception and consciousness of death. The sense therefore is, that they have tasted the heavenly gift, not by some slight and superficial contact with it, but by a clear apprehension joined with a will changed to love God. Moreover, the Apostle uses the word tasting, 1. in reference to the *persons themselves tasting*, who, since they endured for a season, truly tasted before they fell, how good the Lord is, and how good the heavenly gift is; but because having fallen they broke off that taste, it did not therefore remain in them a constant spiritual eating. 2. In reference to the *objects tasted*, viz., the heavenly gift, the good word of God and the powers of the world to come. These are very good (valde dulcia) and greatly delight us. 3. Because *these good things all and singular are not fully apprehended in this life* but will be fully enjoyed in heaven.

By the *heavenly gift* Chrysostom and Theophylact understand the remission of sins. Some understand it of *peace and tranquility* of conscience; others, as Primasius and Haymo, understand it of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, which is truly a heavenly gift given to us to taste. E. J. Laurence also inclines to this view, and explains it of true and saving faith, which is and is called the gift of God, Eph. 2 : 8, because it is given by God, Phil. 1 : 29. Fauborn and Dorsch understand by *heavenly gift*, Christ, as God and man, in so far as he kindled faith in those persons before their fall, and by faith gave them remission of sins, righteousness and salvation; for he came down from heaven, John 3 : 18, is ἀνῶθεν ἐρχόμενος, v. 31, is the gift of God the Father, v. 15. It is best understood, says Gerhard, for πρῶγεύσις, or *foretaste of everlasting life, whose por-*

ers here are enjoyed like a foretaste which is *χαρίσμα*, a gracious and most blessed gift of God, Rom. 6 : 23. (3). "They were made partakers of the Holy Ghost." Some understand this of the extraordinary graces (*χαρίσματα*) of the Holy Ghost, which are called *gifts of administration*, of which many believers in the early Church were made partakers. It is better understood of the *sanctifying gifts of the Holy Ghost*, or of the gifts of justifying and sanctifying grace which pertain to renewal, and are common to all true believers, though not in equal degree. *The partaking (μετοχή) of the Holy Spirit*, (says Calov, *Biblia Illus.*), denotes true and real reception and participation, as appears from Heb. 3 : 14; 4 : 1, 14; 12 : 8; 1 Cor. 10 : 17. Those therefore who are made partakers of the Holy Ghost, by his gracious indwelling, and by the communication of spiritual gifts, are truly born again. But such are they who commit this sin. Ergo.

Therefore the enlightening becomes gracious by partaking of the Holy Ghost, since he enlightens the eyes of the understanding, Eph. 1 : 17. 4. *They have tasted the good word of God.* By this, some understand the Holy Scripture in general, which contains in itself the law and the Gospel, since even the law itself is just, and holy, and good, Rom. 7 : 12; 1 Tim. 1 : 8. But the law of Moses, neither in so far as it is a norm and rule of human action, nor in so far as it is the doctrine and word of God, is in any principal sense the object of the sin against the Holy Ghost, as is evident in part from the consent of all the theologians, in part from a comparison of passages, which treat of this sin, for they all recognize the *doctrine of the Gospel* as the object. Therefore we understand here by the *good word of God*, especially the *Gospel*, as distinguished from the law, in which (the Gospel) we *taste*, that is, we learn and experience with peculiar delight, how good God is, Ps. 34 : 9; 1 Pet. 2 : 3. For the Gospel is not only a grateful testimony of God's love to us, but it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, Rom. 1 : 16, and the doctrine of our redemption through Christ, and the word of salvation, Acts. 13 : 16, the word of life, Acts 5 : 20; Philip. 2 : 16, the word of reconciliation, 2 Cor. 5 : 19.

Estius well says, "They have tasted the good word of God, who with joy and delight have received the doctrine which promises heavenly blessings. For the word of God is said to be tasted, remarks St. Thomas, when it not only illumines the mind, but also renews the affections." Some explain *to taste* by *to take notice of superficially*, as it were to touch with the tips of the lips. But this is contrary to the use of Holy Scripture, in which tasting, either literally or figuratively, is used even of those things which are drunk even in full measure, Heb. 2 : 9. The text adds: "The powers of the world to come," *δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*. Calvin and others of the Reformed understand these words as referring to some apprehension of the future felicity and blessedness, which are announced through the preaching of the Gospel, and promised to believers. Tossanus understands it of the beginning of the new kingdom in this life, in which Christ effectually calls the elect, but destroys his enemies by his power. It is best explained, says Gerhard, from verse 4: "*Have tasted the heavenly gift.*" The world to come, *αἰὼν μέλλον*, in Scripture, denotes the future state, after the general resurrection from the dead, as appears from the distinction made by Christ in Matt. 12 : 32. Compare Mark, 10 : 30, Luke 10 : 30. By the powers of the world to come, Feurborn understands the spiritual and unspeakable joys born of the Gospel and the enlightening of the Holy Ghost, which truly include a foretaste of the powers and blessings and gifts of eternal life. In the same manner Dannhauer understands, by the powers of the world to come, not miracles in the kingdom of grace, which nowhere are said to be tasted, nor offered to the taste of all; but foretastes of eternal life, which in the Scriptures are frequently called the world to come, Matt. 12 : 32. Hunnius says, "The powers of the world to come is that unspeakable joy of the pious coming to us from the word and the Holy Ghost, which is truly a foretaste of the blessings, and of the power of that life to come." (5). They who commit this sin are called *παραπεσοντες*. But he who has never stood can in no sense be said to *fall*, compare Rom. 14 : 4; 1 Cor. 10 : 12. Moreover, the discussion here is in regard to those who were converted *per μετανοίαν*, that is, by true repentance,



for the Apostle speaks of *renewal* to repentance. Therefore if it be not possible for them to be *renewed* to repentance, they must necessarily have repented before they *fell*. But renewal to repentance is understood of true repentance, which does not at all exist without true faith.

Observe (III). The apostle says, if such *fall* afterwards, that is, turn away utterly from truth once known and sealed upon their hearts. *Ἠραπύτωμα*, therefore, or falling, in this passage embraces a rejection of the *terminus a quo*, namely, of the divine truth already known, and denotes complete apostasy from Christ and his Gospel; nor yet apostasy and defection simply, for even Peter denied Christ three times with cursing, and therefore fell, but from weakness, and again repented. Matt. 26 : 70. Also very many Christians under persecution of the heathen turned away from the Christian faith and doctrine; yet many of them afterwards repented and were received into the bosom of the Church. Therefore we must here understand final and malicious apostasy joined with hatred and persecution of Christ and of his Gospel, that is, that particular sin which especially is called the sin against the Holy Ghost, and the sin unto death, Matt. 12 : 31, 32; Mark 3 : 28, 29; Luke 12 : 10. This is proved (1) by the words which immediately follow, *crucifying unto themselves afresh* (that is as far as in them lies,) *the Son of God and putting him to an open shame*; or, as the Vulgate has it, *ostentatione triumphantes*; as Ambrose, exposing him to mockery; as Erasmus, branding him with infamy; as others from Matt. 1 : 19 understand, with malice aforethought and against the inner witness of conscience and of the Holy Ghost, proceeding to that extent of impiety that they persecute Christ and his Gospel and load them with reproach and calumny. It means, therefore, impious calumny and haughty blasphemy in which the soul takes delight. (2.) From the parallel, Heb. 10 : 26, where *παράπιπτειν*, *to fall*, is explained by *ἐκουσίως*, *wilfully*, that is, voluntarily, and with deliberate malice and determined purpose *to sin, after receiving a knowledge of the truth, v. 29, to trample the Son of God under foot, and to count the blood of the covenant by which we are sanctified, an unholy thing*, that is, to regard it as the blood of a villainous person, as Grotius explains, and to blaspheme the Spirit of grace.

• Observe, (IV.) Now at length follows the *Predicate*; it is *impossible to renew them again unto repentance*. It does not say that those who sin in this way are converted with difficulty, but *ἀδύνατον*, it is verily *impossible* that they should be renewed again unto repentance. In Scripture *ἀδύνατον* is used in five different senses: 1. As meaning, improper, unfit, unbecoming that which is right, Matt. 9 : 15. "*The children of the bridegroom cannot mourn*," Matt. 6 : 24. "No man can serve two masters," 1 Cor. 10 : 21. "Ye cannot drink the cup of God and the cup of devils." 2. As *difficult to do, rare*, Matt. 5 : 14. "A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid," that is, not easily, rarely, can be hid, Mark 9 : 29. 3. As *αβουλατον*, Gen. 43 : 52, "The Egyptians might not eat with the Hebrews," that is, are not willing. Mark 6 : 5 : "He could do no mighty work," that is, was unwilling to perform any miracle in his own city of Nazareth. 4. As *ἀδύνατον* naturae creatae, because it transcends the power of human nature, but not the divine; Matt. 19 : 26; Mark 10 : 27; Luke 18 : 27. 5. As *actu ipso*, absolutely, and simply impossible, and not able to be done. In this passage *ἀδύνατον* is not used in the second sense, that is, it is not the same as *χαλεπὸν*, very difficult, as the Socinians and some others say; but in the fifth sense, namely, that it is utterly and absolutely impossible. In the Vulgate *πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν* is rendered passively, "to be renewed again." So also Chrysostom explains it, and Luther likewise receives it in the passive sense, and says, *das sie sollen wiederum erneuert werden zur Busse*, as if the apostle had said *ἀνακαινισθῆναι*. But in Greek it is active, *ἀνακαινίζειν*, to *renew*. According to Erasmus and others, some word must be understood, as *ἑαυτοὺς*, or simply *αὐτοὺς*, so that the meaning is, *it is impossible to renew themselves to repentance*, that is, it is impossible that they should repent or be brought to true repentance, because, forsooth, they despise the means through which God works repentance in the hearts of men. But, *ἀδύνατον*, it is *impossible* that such should be *renewed again*. Therefore they must certainly have been renewed before; for both the word *πάλιν* and the particle *ἀνα* denote iteration.

Observe (V.) The cause of this so great impossibility is not,

1. The utter absence of merit, nor, 2. Absolute reprobation on the part of God. The merciful will of God and the merit of Christ extending to all, oppose both these propositions. Christ has made complete satisfaction even for non-appropriation of his merits so far as that itself is also a sin; but salvation fails, not because God absolutely and ante-judicially wills it to fail, but because the person unceasingly resists the divine ordinance. *It is impossible*, says Dannhauer (viz., that those who thus sin be led to true repentance) *not by the impossibility of the decree of reprobation, absolute, peremptory*, (as Jac. Laurence explains), but by an impossibility resulting from human depravity. Heb. 10 : 26, 27, 28.

Observe (I.) The apostle is here speaking of the sin against the Holy Ghost. We prove this by the following syllogism : Whatsoever sin, 1. after one has received a knowledge of the truth, not *theoretical*, but *practical*, not bare knowledge, but knowledge by illumination and true conversion, (compare Heb. 6 : 4, 5). 2. *wilfully* and as it were with uplifted hand, not terrified by threats nor allured by promises, from sheer contempt, knowingly and purposely, is committed. 3. is joined with final contempt and rejection of the means of salvation, with ignominious trampling under foot of the Son of God, a crucifying anew, and a profane rejection of his blood and merits, and wicked contempt and profanation of the same, and with contempt and contemptuous blasphemy of the Holy Ghost,—that is none other than the sin against the Holy Ghost. But such is this sin. Ergo.

Observe (II.) Those thus sinning (*a.*) are said to sin wilfully, v. 26, where “wilfully” is not opposed to the more internal affections of the mind, so that he who out of pure hatred and hostility to God, denies, opposes, blasphemes known revealed truth, can in no sense be said to have done it involuntarily or against his will; but “wilfully” is opposed to exciting causes from without, such as imminent dangers, captivity, threats of murder, and other misfortunes, or even promises of reward, the seductions and persuasion of heretics, and other similar outside antecedent causes, under whatever name they may come, under circumstances that they do not leave a purely free will to the sinner, but bind it, lead it into captivity, obscure it.

Those sinning thus are said to sin presumptuously, Num. 15 : 30, LXX. *with a high hand*, that is, with all their powers and might, with boldness and arrogance, and sin, as it were, by contempt, as Votablus paraphrases this expression. The Greeks say *γυμνῇ κεφαλῇ ἁμαρτανεῖν*; β) to sin after receiving a knowledge of the truth, which is the same as to recede from the knowledge of the truth once received, and, per consequence, to return to former sinful and wicked habits, 2 Pet. 2 : 22. *Ἀλήθεια* here means, the truth of the Gospel, as also in John 3 : 21; 8 : 31, 32; 14 : 6; 17 : 17; 2 Cor. 4 : 2; Gal. 2 : 5. (γ.) They are said to trample under foot the Son of God their Redeemer; not physically to bruise him under their feet, as the word is used, 2 Chron. 25 : 18; Eze. 26 : 2; Nah. 3 : 14; Matt. 5 : 13; Luke 12 : 1; but *morally*, that is, to treat him reproachfully, to oppose him, to esteem him lightly and as nothing.

The other passage, Heb. 6 : 6, favors this meaning, when they are said to crucify the Son of God and to put him to an open shame, or according to Erasmus, to expose him to insult, (δ.) to count the blood of the covenant by which they are sanctified an unholy thing. But they count the blood of the New Testament, that is, the blood of Christ, (as he explains, Matt. 26 : 28), *common*, who think that it has no greater power to cleanse for sin than the blood of others; or according to Theophylact, that it differs in no sense from other blood. Chrysostom unites the two views, when he says, "What is common? That which is unclean, or has nothing different from other things." When Paul therefore says *ἐν ᾧ ἡγιασθη*, *ἐν* is equivalent to *διὰ*, *per*, as frequently elsewhere; so that the meaning is, through or by means of which he has been sanctified. But sanctification is either that which is acquired by merit, as when Christ sanctified himself for us, John 17 : 19, that is, offered and consecrated himself a holy expiatory sacrifice to God the Father, Eph. 5 : 1; Heb. 9 : 14, 28; or it is righteousness applied by faith, as when Christ offers, confers, and bestows upon us heavenly benefits acquired through his meritorious righteousness, Eze. 22 : 12; 37 : 28; John 17 : 17; Acts 20 : 32; 1 Cor. 1 : 2; 6 : 2; Eph. 5 : 26; 2 Tim. 2 : 21; Heb. 2 : 2; 12 : 14. Here

VOL. XIV. No. 2.

34

the Apostle is speaking of sanctification by which Christ's holiness is offered to us through the Spirit of grace by means of the Gospel, and by us is apprehended by faith. (ε.) To do despite to the Spirit of grace. He is called the Spirit of grace from Zach. 12 : 10, because he seals in us the grace of God, that is, the work of sanctification. This Spirit of grace himself is the personal object of blasphemy. But the personality of the Holy Ghost is understood cum προσθήκη, that is, not *immediately*, but through the instrumentality of the word and the sacraments, enlightening men and certifying them of the will of God, and by certain operations confirming the truth of the divine word. *Ενυβρίζειν* means *to brand with shame, to expose to ignominy*, not secretly, but publicly, and openly, by public exposure and example.

Observe (III.) The consequence and effect (taken in their fullest and widest sense) of the sin against the Holy Ghost the Apostle describes 1. per ἀναίρεσιν or negatively. 2. per θέσιν or affirmatively. Per ἀναίρεσιν when he says that *no more sacrifice remains for the sins of him* who voluntarily and deliberately, and moved by his own determined purpose, turns away from known truth, and thus rejects Christ his Redeemer (by whose sacrifice his sins had already been atoned for) and counts him as nothing. This language means that without Christ there remains no expiatory sacrifice, or that except Christ there exists absolutely no sacrifice of reconciliation. It is not therefore intimidated by this language that Christ *omitted* to offer a sacrifice for those who sin against the Holy Ghost (as the Calvinists hold), but it asserts the *unity* of the expiatory sacrifice, and does away with the *plurality* of the same. For the Apostle means to declare that they will certainly perish if they turn away from Christ to Judaism, because Christ is the only sacrifice of expiation, and that if this be rejected, there remains no other. Compare John 16 : 6; Acts 4 : 12; 10 : 43.

Per θέσιν or affirmatively the Apostle states the consequence of the sin against the Holy Ghost when he says that to those thus sinning nothing more remains except "a certain fearful looking for of judgment and of fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries." For since this sin is the most heinous,

therefore the consequence will not only be the simple punishment of damnation, but a special and most vehement punishment, v. 28. From a comparison of the doctrine of Christ in the New Testament with that of Moses in the Old, the Apostle shows that they who turn away from the doctrine of Christ, deserve a sorer punishment than they who through apostasy turn away from the law of Moses.

[The statement made on page 258 that the Pharisees were regenerated and renewed, is in accordance with the teaching of the pure Lutheran theology, that the sacraments are not only signs and seals of grace, but are really efficacious means of grace, or to limit the matter to the sacrament of baptism, and to use the words of Carpov in his commentary on the Augsburg Confession, "Baptismus *organon* est non tantum *offerens atque conferens* gratiam justificationis, sed etiam medium *operans* respectu regenerationis et renovationis." But by this it must not be understood that baptism justifies without faith. So early as 1523 Luther wrote, "Certe baptismus sine fide non justificat, fides autem sine baptismo justificat," nor must it be understood that baptism regenerates per se, for in Luther's Catechism it is declared that it is not the water that produces the effects of baptism, "but the word of God, which is connected with the water, and our faith confiding in this word of God, in the use of baptismal water."

The Lutheran Church sets a high value on the sacrament of baptism, which in the new covenant has taken the place of circumcision in the old covenant, but it nowhere teaches, either in its confessions, or in the writings of its great standard theologians, that baptism is *absolutely and unconditionally* necessary to salvation. It is true the Augsburg Confession, Art. IX. does say that baptism is "necessary to salvation"; and "that through baptism the grace of God is offered." But the necessity here expressed, as can be abundantly shown from the testimony of all the Lutheran dogmaticians from the days of the Reformation down to the present, means simply the necessity of compliance on our part with the ordained ordinary means of salvation. These means do not limit God, neither does salvation fail where access to the means cannot be had. It is a *locus classicus* in Lutheran Theology that not the deprivation, but the contempt of baptism condemns.

It is gratifying to observe that the best modern theological thinking is approximating the Lutheran standpoint in its view of this sacrament. Dr. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. III., p. 584, says: "Baptism has the necessity of precept." On p. 589 he says: "Baptism is not only a sign and seal; it is also a means of grace, because in it the blessings which it signifies are conveyed, and the promises of which it is the seal, are assured or fulfilled to those who are baptized, provided they believe." The Lutheran position has always been that baptism does not profit without faith. Treating of the baptism of infants, Dr. Hodge, p. 590, asks: "What is to

hinder the imputation to them of the righteousness of Christ, or their receiving the renewing of the Holy Ghost, so that their whole nature may be developed in a state of reconciliation with God. Doubtless this often occurs; but whether it does or not, their baptism stands good."

Dr. Van Dyke in a recent article in the *Presbyterian Review* has stated in the very strongest language, that baptism unites infants with Christ, regenerates them and makes them members of the invisible Church.

Dr. Pope, (Methodist) Theological Tutor in Didsbury College, England, declares that baptism is not a sign and seal merely, but that it conveys the blessings of salvation.

The Lutherans have not "softened down" their position as Dr. Hodge assumes, but the Reformed are toning up their position, and are gradually coming to a better understanding and a higher appreciation of the great truth enunciated in the ninth article of the Augsburg Confession, that baptism is "necessary to salvation; that through baptism, the grace of God is offered. And that children are to be baptized, who being by baptism offered to God, are received into his favor."—Tr.]

---

## ARTICLE IV.

### THE LAW OF CHARITABLE AND RELIGIOUS TRUSTS.\*

By REV. WILLIAM HULL, Hudson, N. Y.

Trusts in general are where the owner of property, either personal or real, conveys it to another party for the benefit of a third party. The second party becomes a trustee, who administers the trust for the benefit of the third party, who is called in law the *cestui qui trust*. This Justice Story pronounces a barbarous Norman French phrase, and he preferred the word "beneficiary" to designate the party who received the income or profit of the property involved. The legal estate is in the trustee—the equitable estate is in the beneficiary. Before the distinction in the courts of Law and Equity were obliterated in this state by the Constitution of 1846, the courts of Law took cognizance of the estate as held by the trustee, and the courts of Equity took cognizance of the interests of the beneficiary.

To create a trust there must be four things, viz.:

1. A subject matter or property.

---

\*A Lecture delivered before the students of Hartwick Seminary, by the author, as Lecturer on Ecclesiastical Law in that Institution.



2. A person legally competent to create the trusts.
3. One legally competent to hold the property as a trustee.
4. One for whose benefit the trust is held.

But in this lecture I do not propose to speak of trusts in general, which comprise a very broad field of law, but only of one branch or department, and I therefore call your attention to

#### THE LAW OF CHARITABLE AND RELIGIOUS TRUSTS.

"The term charity as used in an equitable sense, does not simply import relief to the poor and needy; but rather a gift to a general public use, including the rich as well as the poor," (*Tiffany and Bullard's Law of Trusts and Trustees*, 232). Money or property donated by a person in his lifetime, or by will after his decease, for a school or a hospital, or such a gift as George Peabody made to trustees for the erection of houses for the deserving poor in London, at a very moderate rent, come under the designation of Charitable Trusts. The courts have said that, "the term 'charitable' has a more extensive significance than in common parlance. Charity in its original sense denotes all the good affections men ought to bear to each other—in its more restricted and common sense, relief of the poor." St. Paul had in his mind the enlarged sense when he said, "and though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing, (1 Cor. 13 : 3). The courts have held that property left by will for the building of a bridge for general use, comes under the head of a Charitable Trust.

"The ancient Athenians," says Chancellor Kent, "had humane institutions for the relief and support of disabled soldiers, and which afterward embraced the aged, the sick, the blind, and infirm of every description; and thus charitable provision has been attributed to Solon, (*St. John's History of the Manners and Customs of Ancient Greece*, Vol. vii., 69-74). The ancient Romans never provided any asylum for the poor. Humanity was no part of the national character. Its cultivation as a public duty is one of the inestimable blessings of the introduction of Christianity. Constantine, the first Christian Cæsar, founded the first public system for the relief of pauperism. There did

not exist in the Roman legislation any provision for the poor, unless says Hugo (*History of the Roman Law*, Sec. 1 54), we may consider the law of the twelve tables, which regulated funeral expenses, to have been introduced in their favor as a means to prevent the ruin of families. But there was a provision in favor of the Roman soldiers, which shows the wise policy if not the humanity of the Roman discipline," (3 *Kent's Commentaries*, 181).

Judge Story says, "It is highly probable that the rudiments of the law of charities were derived from the Roman or Civil Law. One of the earliest fruits of the Emperor Constantine's real or pretended zeal for Christianity, was a permission to his subjects to bequeath their property to the Church. This permission was soon abused to so great a degree as to induce the Emperor Valentinian to enact a mortmain law by which it was restrained. But this restraint was gradually relaxed, and in the time of Justinian it became a fixed maxim of Roman jurisprudence, that legacies to pious uses (which included all legacies destined for works of piety or charity, whether they related to spiritual or temporal concerns), were entitled to peculiar favor, and to be deemed privileged testaments," (2 *Story's Equity Jurisprudence*, § 1137).

Charitable Trusts were those relating more particularly to the temporal condition of men and Religious Trusts having more in view their spiritual interests and good.

During the dark ages, when superstition prevailed to so great a degree, a large proportion of the property in European countries was donated or devised to the Church and to religious orders. Chancellor Kent says, "Corporations are excepted out of the English statute of wills, and the object of the law was to prevent property from being locked up in perpetuity, and also to prevent languishing and dying persons from being imposed upon by false notions of merit or duty, to give away their estates from their families. In times of popery, said Lord Hardwicke, the clergy got nearly half the real property of the kingdom into their hands, and he wondered they had not got the whole," (4 *Kent's Commentaries*, 507).

In France, the confiscation of the property of the religious

houses paid largely the public expenses for a time in the days of the first Napoleon, and recently on the overthrow of the power of the Papal See, the confiscation of the same kind of property, amounting to some five or six hundred millions of dollars, has largely aided in meeting the expenses of the kingdom of Italy.

In order to prevent so much property from getting into the hands of the religious houses in the days of superstition in England, Parliament passed several mortmain acts. Blackstone says, "Alienation in mortmain, in *mortua manu* is an alienation of lands or tenements to any corporation, sole or aggregate, ecclesiastical or temporal. But these purchases having been chiefly made by religious houses, in consequence whereof the lands became perpetually inherent in one dead hand, this hath occasioned the general appellation of mortmain to be applied to such alienations, and the religious houses themselves to be principally considered in forming the statutes of mortmain; in declaring the history of which statutes, it will be a matter of curiosity to observe the great address and subtle contrivance of the ecclesiastics, in eluding from time to time the laws in being, and the zeal with which successive Parliaments have pursued them through all their finesses; how new remedies were the parents of new evasions; till the legislature at last, though with difficulty, hath obtained a decisive victory," (*Blackstone's Commentaries*, Vol. II., 268). He further says, in the same connection, "Yet such were the influence and ingenuity of the clergy, that we find the largest and most considerable donations of religious houses happened within two centuries after the Conquest," (*Ibid*, 269).

In England in the forty-third year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth a very important statute was enacted which is emphatically called the "Statute of Charitable Uses." It opens by reciting that lands, goods, money, etc., had been heretofore given to certain purposes, which are enumerated, and that this property had not been used according to the charitable intent of the givers and founders, by reason of frauds, breaches of trust, and negligence of those who should pay, deliver and employ them. The statute then confers power upon the Lord

Chancellor to see that the lands, goods and money be faithfully employed to and for the charitable uses for which they were given, and to listen to the complaint of any party aggrieved. The uses described by that statute as good and charitable are as follows: "For relief of aged and impotent or poor people; for maintainance of sick and maimed soldiers, schools of learning, free schools, scholars in universities, houses of correction; for repairs of bridges, of ports and havens, of causeways, of churches, of seabanks, of highways; for education and preferment of orphans, for marriage of poor maids, for support and help of young tradesmen, of handicraftsmen, of persons decayed; for redemption or relief of prisoners or captives, for care and aid of poor inhabitants, concerning payment of fifteenths, setting out of soldiers and other taxes, (*See Tiffany and Bullard on the Law of Trusts and Trustees*, 233).

"Although the Court of Chancery exercised jurisdiction over charities anterior to the statute of 43 Elizabeth, and although it is now held both in England and in the United States, that chancery has original jurisdiction in such cases, yet, since that statute, no bequests are deemed within the authority of chancery, capable of being established and regulated thereby, except bequests for those purposes which the statute enumerates as charitable, or which by analogy are deemed to be within its spirit and intendment. It is not necessary however that the gift shall be within the *letter* of that statute, if it be within the *spirit* and intendment," (*Ibid*, 234).

The following objects have been held as charitable under the statute, viz., gifts for diffusing the Protestant tenets of the Christian religion and promoting public worship according to those tenets, and providing for its ministers—bequests for the advancement of the Christian religion among infidels—for the support of dissenting ministers in England—for the support of the preacher of a certain chapel—for the repairing of parsonage houses—for building of a church—for the augmentation of poor vicarages—for paying off an incumbrance on a licensed meeting house—for the support of a burial ground—for maintaining a preaching minister—for a Protestant dissenting chapel—for the building of a session house for a city or county—for the

making of a new or the repairing of an old pulpit—the buying of a pulpit cloth or cushion—for the setting up of new bells—for repairing bells out of order—for a minister to preach an annual sermon and to keep a tombstone and inscription in repair—for the vicar or curate of a certain place for preaching an annual sermon on a certain day—for the singers sitting in the gallery of a certain church to be paid on a certain day—for benevolent and charitable purposes with recommendation to apply it to domestic servants—to establish a life-boat—for the Welch circulating charity schools—to buy Bibles and other religious books to be divided among poor, pious persons—a devise of property to the cause of Christ for the benefit of true evangelical piety and religion, to be distributed in such divisions and to such societies and religious and charitable purposes as the trustees might think just and proper—for the American Bible Society, or of any other charitable association, for the use and purposes of said society—for money to a church to be laid out for bread yearly, for ten years for the poor of the congregation—for the poor of any particular parish or county or town—for the dissemination of the Gospel at home and abroad—for the New York Yearly Meeting of Friends, called Orthodox, for the use of its ministers in straitened circumstances—for an unincorporated religious association, to be applied as a fund for the distribution of good books among poor people in the back part of Pennsylvania—for the support of an institution or free school in or near Philadelphia—for the poor and needy and fatherless of two townships named—for school and educational purposes generally—for unincorporated fire companies generally, &c. These have all been held to have been within the spirit and intentment of the statute of 43 Elizabeth.

There has been much discussion among the legal profession whether these trusts for charitable purposes have their origin in the Statute of Elizabeth, or whether they were of the class of which Chancery under the Common Law had jurisdiction previous to that statute. Judge Story discusses this question at large, in his *Equity Jurisprudence*, and he says, "Upon the whole, it now seems to be the better opinion that the jurisdic-

tion of the Court of Chancery over charities, where no trust is interposed, or where there is no person *in esse* capable of taking, or where the charity is of an indefinite nature, is to be referred to the general jurisdiction of that court, anterior to the Statute of Elizabeth. This opinion is supported by the preponderating weight of the authorities speaking to the point, and particularly by those of a very recent date, which appear to have been thoroughly considered. The language of the statute lends a confirmation to this opinion and enables us to trace, what would otherwise seem a strange anomaly, to a legitimate origin, (2 *Story's Equity Jurisprudence*, § 1162.

In many of the states the distinction of the English system between courts of law and equity are maintained and the principles of the Common Law are everywhere recognized except where abrogated by positive statute. In our own state the law and equity powers are comprised in one set of courts, and they have jurisdiction in Charitable and Religious Trusts. "Chancellor Kent thinks that the Statute of 43 Elizabeth did not intend to give any new validity to charitable donations, but rather was designed to provide a new and more effectual remedy for the breaches of those trusts. The statute defined what charities chancery would protect, and which were to be enforced; but it left the jurisdiction of chancery as it existed prior to it, untouched. Although the statute of charitable uses was not extended to Pennsylvania, yet the principles of that statute have been adopted by their courts, and they give relief in all cases where their means admit of it, nearly to the same extent as does chancery in England," (*Tiffany and Bullard on the Law of Trusts and Trustees*, 259).

We may notice as a general principle in connection with this subject,

1. THAT DEVICES FOR CHARITABLE AND RELIGIOUS USES ARE FAVORED BY THE COURTS.

As our system of jurisprudence is the outgrowth of the English system, as developed in the Common Law, the objects of Charitable and Religious Trusts are similar in the two countries, and the administration of these trusts by the courts are similar.

Judge Story says: "Charities are always so highly favored in

the law that they have always received a more liberal construction than the law will allow in gifts to individuals. In the first place the same words in a will, when applied to individuals, may require a very different construction when they are applied to the case of a charity. If a testator give his property to such person as he shall hereafter name to his executor, and afterward he appoints no executor; or if, having appointed an executor, the latter dies in the lifetime of the testator and no other is appointed in his stead; in either of these cases, as these bequests are to individuals, the testator will be held intestate, and his next of kin will take the estate. But if a like bequest be given to an executor in favor of a charity, the Court of Chancery will in both instances supply the place of an executor and carry into effect that very bequest, which in the case of individuals must have failed altogether."

"Again: in the case of an individual, if an estate is devised to such person as the testator shall name, and no executor is appointed: or if one being appointed he dies in the testator's lifetime, and no other is appointed in his place; the bequest becomes a mere nullity. Yet such a bequest, if expressed for a charity, would be good, and the Court of Chancery would in such case assume the office of an executor and execute it. So if a legacy is given to trustees to distribute in charity, and they all die in the testator's lifetime; although the legacy becomes then lapsed at law (and if the trustees had taken to their own use it had been gone forever) yet it will be enforced in Equity."—(2 *Story's Equity Jurisprudence*, §1165, 1166.)

Not only have the courts favored devises for charitable and religious objects more than to individuals, but the doctrine has been carried so far to sustain them that Judge Story says, "Another principle equally well established is, that if the bequest be for charity, it matters not how uncertain the persons or the objects may be: or whether the persons who are to take are *in esse* or not: or whether the legatee be a corporation, capable in law of taking or not: or whether the bequest can be carried into exact execution or not: for in all these and the like cases, the court will sustain the legacy, and give it effect according to its own principles. And where a literal execution becomes inexpe-



dient or impracticable, the court will execute it as nearly as it can according to the original purpose. This doctrine seems to have been borrowed from the Roman law; for by that law donations for public purposes were sustained and were applied when illegal to other purposes, at least one hundred years before Christianity became the law of the empire. (2 *Story's Equity Jurisprudence*, §1069.)

Where a devise was made to the poor generally, the court directed it to be executed in favor of three public charities in London. Where a devise was made of one half the interest of a certain sum for the redemption of British slaves in Turkey or Barbary, and there were no such slaves, the court decreed the application of that part to two other charities named.

To further charities the court will supply all defects in conveyances where the donor has capacity and a disposable estate, and his mode of donation does not contravene the provisions of any statute. *Duke on Charitable Uses* says, that a disposition of lands to charitable uses is good although "there be defect in the deed, or in the will by which they were first created and raised: either in the party trusted with the use where he is misnamed, or the like." (84, 85.)

Another general principle in connection with this subject is that,

II. THE COURTS WILL ENDEAVOR TO CARRY OUT THE INTENTION OF THE DONOR.

This is a general principle of law in the construction of all bequests, but the courts favoring devises to charity, carry the doctrine further in regard to them than in cases affecting individuals. Thus where there was a bequest to the governors of a society for the "increase and encouragement of good servants," and no such institution could be found, it was held that the gift was charitable and did not fail; and that it was the duty of the court to effectuate the general intention of the testator the best it could.

If the gift for charity be special, and a general charitable intent cannot be found, and the object declared be illegal, the charity will fail and the property will go to the next of kin; but if the gift create a general trust for charity, the particular pur-

pose being illegal, will not affect the validity of the general trust, but the duty of appropriating the amount in England devolves upon the crown; in the United States it devolves upon the Legislature.

*Tiffany and Bullard* in their treatise on *The Law of Trusts and Trustees*, say, (248, 249, 250, 251), "It has been claimed that a pious use cannot be sustained by a court of justice in a country where the truths of religion have not been settled and defined by law, or where the judges have not the discretionary power to determine and declare them." The Judge in the case of *Andrew vs. The New York Bible and Prayer Book Society*, (4 *Sanford's S. C. Reports*, 178), held, "that under a Constitution which extends the same protection to every religion, and to every form and sect of religion, which establishes none, and gives no preference to any, there is no possible standard by which the validity of a use as 'pious' can be determined," that "there are no possible means by which judges can be enabled to discriminate between such uses as tend to promote the best interests of society, by spreading the knowledge and inculcating the practice of true religion, and those which can have no other effect than to foster the growth of pernicious errors, to give a dangerous permanence to the reveries of a wild fanaticism, or encourage and perpetuate the observance of a corrupt and degrading superstition."

But this reasoning of the Court was fallacious, because the principles upon which it was based were fallacious. A court does not endorse the theological opinions of the Methodist, Episcopalian, the Presbyterian or the Catholic by sustaining a gift as a charity to such denominations. The court does not try the validity of the "pious use" by the legal orthodoxy of the sect for whose benefit it was given, and Judge Willard well remarks (*Willard's Equity Jurisprudence*, 577-596), "The only limit to toleration is at a point where licentiousness, or practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state commence, and it is the province of the court to determine, incidentally indeed, but no less decisively, when that point has been reached." The like principle has been sustained in the case of *Williams vs. Williams*, (4 *Seldon's N. Y. Reports*, 525). A re-

ligious denomination whose essential tenets inculcated practices prohibited by the laws of the state, as bigamy by the Mormons, would not probably be encouraged; and a gift for the purpose of promulgating such tenets, would most probably be deemed illegal," (*Terrett vs. Taylor*, 9 *Cranch's Reports*, 43).

"Courts of Equity disclaim all right to interfere with the religious beliefs of any person, or to prevent the full enjoyment by every citizen of all the rights of conscience secured by the Constitution. They act upon the principle that the will of the testator shall be carried out as far as possible, consistent with the proper application of those rules of law which govern the state. Consequently they will not permit funds devoted to other objects, even if those for whose use it was given should concur in such diversion, (*Kniskern vs. Lutheran Church of St. John's*, 1 *Sanford's Chancery Reports*, 439). So also where property is conveyed to a religious society or corporation to promote the teaching of particular religious doctrines, on proper application the court will interfere to prevent a diversion of those funds for the purpose of teaching different doctrines; and it is no defense to set up that the deviation from the faith or doctrine to which the property is devoted is sanctioned by a majority of the society, (*App vs. Lutheran Congregation*, 6 *Barr*, 201). "In every case of charity," said Lord Lyndhurst, "whether the object of the charity be directed to religious purposes or those purely civil, it is the duty of the court to give effect to the intent of the founder, providing this can be done without infringing any known rule of law," (*Brown vs. Lutheran Church*, 23 *Penn. St.*, 493). "Where a testator makes a general or special charity, and designates as the object the inculcating of certain religious tenets by a certain society or corporation, it is evident that the gift is for the benefit, not of the individuals themselves, but of the cause they represent; and when they cease to represent the cause which was the object of the trust, they cease to be entitled to control the trust. Thus a gift to a Unitarian Society, to be used for the promulgation of the cause of Unitarianism, by inculcating its tenets, doctrines, etc., is a gift to the cause of Unitarianism; and should such society cease to be Unitarian in faith and teaching, they would cease to rep-

resent the objects of the charity, and hence would cease to be entitled to control the trust."

Let us apply these principles of the Law of Charitable and Religious Trusts to the last will and testament of Rev. John Christopher Hartwick in the devise of his property for the establishment of this institution. He drew the will himself and added eight codicils to it from time to time, the last having been added and the whole signed and witnessed but a few hours before his death. Dr. Pohlman, in his Historical Address, delivered in 1866, at the Semi-Centennial celebration of Hartwick Seminary, says: "It seems he had prepared his will and some ten months before his death had written to an eminent jurist for his opinion in relation to its provisions." The answer of Peter W. Yates, the jurist referred to, was direct and pertinent: "I am of opinion," said he, "that your will and testament as it now stands will not stand the test of law, and by no means answer your good and pious intentions. It is legally defective in every page and almost every sentence. Besides all this there has been so great a change and transmutation of your real estate since you made that will, as will lay the foundation of great and endless litigation. I entreat you therefore to draw one immediately *de novo*. Whatever part of your estate you intend for pious or ecclesiastical purposes, you must give and devise to two or three persons in *fee simple*, in trust for those purposes to which it is to be applied. When you mean to devise any part of your estate to individuals, say so, and devise it to them and their heirs. You may also nominate certain persons who understand the nature of your estate and its difficulties, as your executors and empower them to do, and to act as you wish and intend."

But Mr. Hartwick adhered to what he had written. The witnesses to his will were John R. Livingston and Benjamin Welch, of Columbia County, and John Willison of Dutchess County. He died on the 16th of July, 1796, and in September, 1797, his will was proved in the Surrogate's Court of Albany County. The will, though very peculiar, showed that it was the intention of the testator to establish a school in Otsego County for the education of pastors. Having been witnessed and executed ac-

ording to the statute, it could not have been successfully attacked by his next of kin, as the courts could easily see the intention of the testator; and the devise being for a pious and public use, it would be favored in the courts. Although all the provisions of the will, such as building a city in the vicinity to be called New Jerusalem, etc., could not be carried out, yet the founding of such a school as he designated could be. The act of the legislature directing the incorporation of Hartwick Seminary, says: "*Whereas*, the Rev. John C. Hartwick, deceased, by his last will and testament hath devised a considerable estate for the endowment of a Literary and Theological Seminary, to be established within the bounds of a tract of land whereof he died seized, situated in the town of Hartwick, in the county of Otsego, and *Whereas* one of the declared objects of the said testator was to educate pious young men for the gospel ministry in the Lutheran Church, whereof he was a member," etc., therefore a charter be granted for such institution.

From time to time persons claiming to be the heirs at law of John Christopher Hartwick have threatened litigation for the estate he left, but thus far they have failed to prosecute their claim. Several years ago Hon. Henry Smith, a leading lawyer of Albany, made a very thorough examination of the matter in behalf of certain parties, and he came to the conclusion that they could not recover.

The last call of the kind was a letter written Jan. 18st, 1882, by John Eichler, Attorney at Law, 173 Broadway, N. Y., sent to Professor Pitcher and addressed to "The Trustees of Hartwick Seminary," in which he says, "I have been retained by my client, Mr. August Meng, who is the attorney in fact for twenty-seven persons, who are respectively the heirs at law of John Christopher Hartwick, the founder of your Seminary for the collection of their respective claims and estate under the last will of said Hartwick. I have been informed that negotiations were about to be made but fell to the ground. I have given this matter a thorough investigation, examined my client's necessary papers as to pedigree, etc., and also made the necessary search as to the estate and have come to the conclusion that their claims are good and shall shortly be in a posi-

tion to institute the necessary legal proceedings. Will you therefore kindly inform me, whether or not you are willing to enter into any negotiations in this matter, as we will be able to dispose of this matter more speedily if amicably done. An early answer will oblige, &c."

Prof. Pitcher sent the letter to the Secretary of the Board and it has never been answered, and Mr. Eichler has not been heard from since. In 1875 an article appeared in one of the New York dailies, stating that Mr. Meng had arrived in New York with a power of attorney for twenty-seven persons as heirs at law of Mr. Hartwick, to claim his estate on the ground that the will was defective—that he had retained a lawyer, by the name of William H. Duryea, to institute legal proceedings for the recovery of the estate. Up to this time Mr. Duryea has not been heard from.

In the light of the legal principles announced in this Lecture, where a will met the statute requirement in its execution—where it was duly proved and the executors duly qualified—where the intention was clearly expressed that the property should be devoted to the establishment of a theological seminary—where the legislature acknowledged it as a valid will by directing the chartering of such an institution as the will contemplated, and where this useful Charitable and Religious Trust has been administered for sixty-seven years according to the design of the founder, it can readily be seen that the trust cannot be shaken by the distant heirs at law of John Christopher Hartwick, and their attorneys would do better to save their postage stamps than to waste them in writing letters to the Board of Trustees.

Having illustrated "The Law of Charitable and Religious Trusts" in reference to a school, I call your attention to its application in a celebrated church trial, which occurred forty-four years ago in our own denomination—the report of which occupies one hundred and thirty pages in the first volume of Sandford's New York Chancery Reports. The decision of the Assistant Vice Chancellor occupies seventy pages.

A bill or complaint was filed in the Court of Chancery on the  
VOL. XIV. No. 2.

23d day of March, 1839, by Philip Kniskern and David Angle, two members of the Lutheran church and congregation, or society of New Rhinebeck, in the town of Sharon, Schoharie county, known by the corporate name of "The Ministers and Trustees of the Lutheran Church in Rhinebeck," commonly called St. Peter's or Rhinebeck Church, and Marcus Brown, one of the trustees and David Somner, a member of the Lutheran Church or Society at Durlach, in Sharon, known by the corporate name of "The Evangelical Lutheran Congregation of St. John's Church at Durlach in Sharon," in behalf of themselves and such other members of those churches and congregations as adhere to the faith, doctrines, discipline and government of the Lutheran Church as declared, established and promulgated by the confession and declaration of faith, commonly called the Augsburg Confession of faith.

The Bill set forth that on the 25th of June, 1530, the sect of Protestant Christians, known as Lutherans, presented to the Diet of the empire at Augsburg, in Germany, written articles of faith, since known as the Augsburg Confession of faith, which has been the creed of that denomination since, throughout the world, and that persons professing Lutheran tenets in America are commonly designated in their collective capacity as the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

They further set forth that long prior to 1789 there existed a Lutheran congregation in Schoharie county, known as "The Lutheran Congregation of Cobleskill and New Durlach," in which the Augsburg Confession was adopted and received as its confession of faith, and the Sacraments and ordinances administered. The Lutheran Congregation of Cobleskill and New Durlach in 1789 included the churches at Sharon, New Rhinebeck and Cobleskill. On the 9th of March 1789, Rev. Peter Nicholas Somner, the pastor of the three churches, and Johannes Borst and Johannes Lawyer conveyed one hundred and fifty acres of land in New Durlach to the trustees of the three churches, "for the common use and benefit of said Lutheran congregation forever." The sum of one hundred and fifty pounds paid for the land was raised by the members of the Lutheran pastorate. This land, the three churches of the pas-



torate held in common until 1808, when fifty acres were amicably partitioned to the church at Cobleskill, which then ceased to be a part of the pastorate, and the balance of the land was retained by the Sharon and New Rhinebeck churches.

The Bill says, "All the property of these churches was obtained and given for the sole and only purpose of founding and establishing churches in which the doctrines and tenets of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as then established and declared by the Augsburg Confession of Faith, should be preached and taught and inculcated, and such doctrines were preached and taught from the pulpit, and disseminated in the congregations respectively, until the month of May, 1837, under which preaching great harmony prevailed in the congregation."

On the 27th of October, 1830, the Hartwick Synod was organized, composed of the Sharon, New Rhinebeck and thirty other Lutheran churches, and the two churches remained in connection with the Hartwick Synod until May, 1837, when the Bill charges that, "its connection therewith was illegally and forcibly terminated by the unlawful and heretical acts of the defendants in this suit, contrary to the will and against the remonstrances of all the members who adhered to the Evangelical Lutheran faith as expressed in the Augsburg Confession."

On the 27th of September, 1831, the Hartwick Synod with the approbation of all its churches, united with the General Synod, a body that adhered to the Evangelical Lutheran faith as declared in the Augsburg Confession.

In 1805 Rev. Henry Møller was chosen pastor of the churches and officiated until 1822. Rev. Adam Crownse succeeded him from 1823 to 1828, and both taught the Lutheran doctrines as exhibited in the Augsburg Confession. In 1833 the churches elected Rev. Philip Wieting as pastor, in the belief that he would teach the same doctrines and remain in connection with the Hartwick Synod, and the General Synod, but that on the 10th of May 1837, he with Martin Marclay and John C. Shultz, lay delegates from New Rhinebeck, with other persons claiming to represent ten other Lutheran churches organized a new Synod, called the Franckean Synod, which the Bill charged had "abandoned the Augsburg Confession of Faith as a rule or standard of faith or

practice and adopted a constitution for the government of the Synod, containing a new declaration or confession of faith, declaring the points or articles of belief of the Synod and its churches, to be adopted by them in the place of the Augsburg Confession. The constitution contains rules and restrictions for the government of the churches and tenets of faith and practice unknown to the Augsburg Confession and the Lutheran Church. By this constitution it is declared that the Church Council is independent of any Synod or other superior control; thereby making its decisions final and conclusive and depriving the members of the right of appeal to the Synod and the General Synod guaranteed by the usages and the constitution of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; it is provided that a slaveholder or any person engaged directly or indirectly in the manufacture or traffic of any intoxicating liquors to be used as a beverage is ineligible to represent any church in the Synod as a lay delegate; and every minister is precluded from a seat in the Synod who has not signed the pledge of total abstinence from intoxicating liquor as a beverage, who is a slaveholder or who advocates the system of slavery as it exists in and is authorized by the constitution and laws of the United States."

The Bill further complained that the Confession of Faith of the Franckean Synod differed in essential particulars from the Augsburg Confession, in that,

1. The Franckean Confession did not set forth clearly the doctrine of the Trinity and was essentially Unitarian,
2. That it did not declare or admit the divinity of Jesus Christ, and,
3. That it did not correctly state the doctrine of original sin as set forth in the Augsburg Confession.

The complainants declared that their churches had been taken from the Hartwick Synod, which adhered to the Augsburg Confession and the usages of the Lutheran Church, and were associated with the Franckean Synod, which ignored the Augsburg Confession and taught doctrines contrary to it—that Mr. Wieting officiated as pastor against the wishes and in defiance of the complainants, and of the rights of all the members who adhere to that doctrine and faith as taught by the Lutheran Church.

They stated that all the Trustees, Elders and Deacons of the New Rhinebeck Church adhered to Mr. Wieting and the Franco-kean Synod, and all except two of the officers of the Sharon Church..

The Bill further alleged, "that these two churches were respectively founded and organized by persons who professed the Evangelical Lutheran faith as declared in the Augsburg Confession, for the sole purpose of having such faith preached and promulgated therein, and that the members thereof should be governed and controlled by the ancient constitution, usages and formulas of the Evangelical Lutheran Church."

The Bill declared that the incorporations and their property could not be diverted or appropriated to other uses than those for which they were intended by the founders thereof: that the Trustees were bound to appropriate them to such original uses and purposes, and that it is a violation of such uses and objects to apply or appropriate them to the support of any other church, or of a church in which any other principles, doctrine or faith than those declared in the Augsburg Confession are taught, preached or inculcated, or where discipline or practice is governed by any other constitution, usage, formula or rules than those adopted for the Evangelical Lutheran Church at the time these two churches were founded. The complainants had frequently applied to the defendants in behalf of themselves and the other members adhering to the Augsburg Confession and the Hartwick Synod, and requested them to employ and call, or permit to be employed and called, a pastor for the said churches, in full communion with that Synod and adhering to that Confession, and to apply the property for that object, and to permit the churches to be reunited to the Hartwick Synod, and to be governed by their practice, discipline and church government according to the ancient constitution, usages and formula of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as adhered to by that Synod and the General Synod; to refrain from diverting the church edifices and property to any other use, and to dissolve the pastoral connection with Mr. Wieting, inasmuch as he had abjured the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession and seceded from the Hartwick Synod, with which of right they should still be united.

The relief that the complainants asked of the court was, a decree compelling the defendants to employ a minister of the Hartwick Synod: that the defendants suffer the churches to be reunited to the Hartwick Synod: that the pastoral relations with Mr. Wieting be dissolved: that the Trustees account for the property of the churches and the proceeds and income thereof since and during the time they have diverted the same: that they be removed from their offices, to the end that others may be appointed who will direct, control and administer the two corporations and their property according to the trusts, uses and purposes originally designed.

The defendants joined issue by answer to the Bill or complaint by saying that, "the Bible is the sole standard of the faith, practice, discipline and government of the Lutherans and the defendants deny that all departures from the Augsburg Confession were ever considered heretical, or a departure from the true faith or system of doctrines embraced by the Lutheran churches in Europe or America."

They said that the Augsburg Confession "was not presented by the sect, known as Lutherans, or as a written explanation of their system or summary of doctrines and faith of the Protestant denomination called Lutherans together with the defense of the Augsburg Confession."

They also declared that, "the members and pastor of each individual church, possess all power of government and discipline and the jurisdiction of each is final."

The defendants acknowledged that as early as 1789 these churches existed, but said they were ignorant whether the Augsburg Confession of faith was adopted by them, but they believed from the practice of the churches and from the doctrine taught in them for the last twenty years, that the Augsburg Confession had never been formally adopted by the churches nor assented to by the members."

They denied, "that the real estate or any property or funds were obtained, given or bestowed with the intent or upon the understanding or consideration that the doctrines or tenets of the Augsburg Confession, in all its parts, should be taught in the two churches."

They further declared, that Mr. Wieting preached and taught the fundamental doctrines of the Bible as taught, believed and inculcated by the Evangelical Lutheran Churches in the United States, and which is the system or summary of doctrines contained in the Augsburg Confession of faith.

The defendants further stated that in or before 1796 the New York Ministerium was organized, which comprised all the Lutheran churches in the state of New York and it remained the only Lutheran ecclesiastical body until the Hartwick Synod was formed in 1830—that Mr. Wieting was licensed by the Ministerium in 1825 and ordained in 1826—that he was not required to subscribe to the Augsburg Confession—that he united in the formation of the Hartwick Synod in 1830—that he united in 1837 in the movement to form the Franckean Synod, which he had a right to do.

They averred that at the convention which formed the Franckean Synod, nothing was said about the Augsburg Confession, "and neither the Synod nor its members have abandoned the Confession any more than they had done before. They did then and they do now believe it so far as it agrees with the Bible, and they never disputed it as a system or summary of doctrines."

They denied that they did not receive the doctrine of the Trinity in its fullest extent, or the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ.

They denied as had been alleged, that Mr. Wieting ever publicly, or otherwise, declared that he and those who adhered to him, severed their connection with the Hartwick Synod, or formed Franckean Synod, or adopted the Franckean declaration of faith, because they did not or could not believe the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, or that their principal objection to the Hartwick Synod was that they held that Confession for their Creed.

They further affirmed that Mr. Wieting was officiating in the two churches in accordance with the wishes, consent and approbation of a large majority of the members of these churches.

The pleadings being thus at issue the parties proceeded to take proofs.

The plaintiffs put in evidence "The History, Doctrine and Discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church: by George Lochman, Pastor of the Lutheran Congregation at Harrisburg," published in 1818.

They also put in evidence the Minutes of the first session of the Hartwick Synod, held in Johnstown on the 24th of Sept. 1831,—also the Minutes of the fourth session held at Guilderland on the 6th of September, 1834.

They also put in evidence the Minutes of the first session of the Franckean Synod held at Fordsbush, May 24th, 1837.

From Rev. Mr. Lochman's book they showed that the Augsburg Confession was the creed of the Lutheran Church in the United States—from the Minutes of the first session of the Hartwick Synod they showed its adherence to the Augsburg Confession—from the Minutes of the fourth session they showed that Mr. Wieting as Chairman of a Committee had highly eulogized "Schmucker's Popular Theology, in a report, and said that "it ought to be the next in rank to the Bible in the library of every Lutheran"—they also showed from these Minutes the recommendation of Hartwick Seminary and that in the theological course of the third year the study of the symbolical books was prescribed for the second and third terms.

From the Minutes of the first session of the Franckean Synod, they showed the declaration of faith of that body.

Witnesses were then called and examined.

Rev. Adam Crownse testified that he had been a Lutheran minister for seventeen years—that the Augsburg Confession is the creed of the Lutheran Church—he knew of no other—that at a convention of the two churches in question in 1825 or 1826, when he was pastor, the Augsburg Confession as translated by Rev. Mr. Lochman was formally adopted and the proceedings annexed to a copy of the Confession and attached to the book of records—that at a meeting of the Hartwick Synod in 1836 Mr. Wieting expressed to the witness his doubts or disbelief in some of the points of the Augsburg Confession and his desire to have it altered at that meeting. He objected to the articles on Original Sin, the Lord's Supper, Baptism and Auricular Confession.

On his cross-examination he said, "that one reason assigned for forming the Hartwick Synod, was, that the New York Ministerium had no acknowledged confession of faith. Another was, that their ministers were supposed to be tainted with Socinianism, Arianism and Universalism." He also stated that the Formula of the General Synod contained the Augsburg Confession.

Rev. Thomas Lape testified that he had been a Lutheran minister since 1827—that "Schmucker's Popular Theology" was a standard work in the church—that at a session of the General Synod held at Chambersburg, Penn., in 1839 a resolution was adopted, reciting that persons composing the Franckean Synod were introducing practices which the General Synod considered contrary to the word of God, and thereupon disapproving of the same, and cautioning the Lutheran churches to beware of the efforts of these persons.

Both of these witnesses testified that the Franckean declaration of faith adopted in 1837 does not declare the doctrine of the trinity, the divinity of Christ or that inherited sin is not in itself damning.

Martin Simmons testified that he was present at the dedication of one of the churches, forty or fifty years preceding, and that Rev. Mr. Krotz, who consecrated it, as he finished his sermon said, "Be this house dedicated unto the Lord, an Evangelical Lutheran house of prayer, in which the Gospel is to be preached, and the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper to be dispensed according to the Augsburg Confession."

John A. Strobeck, seventy-seven years of age and who had been forty-seven years a member of the New Rhinebeck church, testified, that he had contributed to that building, for the purpose of having the Lutheran doctrine preached in it according to the Augsburg Confession.

George Longenheldt testified that he had been thirty years a member and four years an elder in the New Rhinebeck church—that the Augsburg Confession was considered the fundamental doctrine in both churches and that members were required to assent to it on being admitted.



John C. Moeller testified that he was fifty-two years of age and a member of the Sharon Church. His father was formerly pastor of these churches. Shortly before the organization of the Franckean Synod he heard Mr. Wieting state from the pulpit his reasons for separating himself from the Hartwick Synod. He said, "he did not believe the Augsburg Confession—that it was an antiquated thing, unfit for the present age." He disapproved of its second article, and said he did not consider original sin condemning. He also objected to the article relative to the Lord's Supper. At a subsequent meeting of the church to elect officers, Mr. Wieting said that the Hartwick Synod held to the Augsburg Confession, and no one could be admitted into that body without subscribing to it. On this occasion he objected to the articles of the Confession relative to Original Sin, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Confession and Absolution and the Ministry.

In January 1838, the witness and several others had joined in a protest against separating from the Hartwick Synod, and declaring their adherence to the Augsburg Confession.

Nicholas Russell testified, that since 1811 he had been a member of the Lutheran Church in Cobleskill—he always considered the Augsburg Confession the fundamental doctrine of that church, and so far as he knew it was always considered the confession of faith of the Lutheran Church in America.

The plaintiffs then rested their case.

The defendants proved and read in evidence the printed copy of the Augsburg Confession, with notes, published in 1837 by the Hartwick Synod, in which the note to the Second Article insists that it does not apply to infants and was never so held by the Lutheran Church. The note to the Ninth Article says that Baptism is necessary—not that it is a saving ordinance, and that on the Tenth Article the note says, "that the church now holds that the Lord's Supper is a commemoration of the sufferings and death of Christ, and in it every worthy communicant receives the body and blood of Christ under the emblems of bread and wine."

The defendants also read from the notes of Dr. Lochman on the same points.

They also proved and read in evidence the Minutes of a special meeting of the Franckean Synod, held Oct. 5, 1837, at which Rev. John D. Lawyer, the President, delivered an address, extracts of which were ordered by the Synod to be printed in its Minutes, in which he denied that they had renounced the Augsburg Confession, and said in reference to the accusation, "What proof is there to substantiate that point? Where in all our proceedings is there one word found about or against that instrument? We have left it where it is, and just as it is. And we do deny that we have formed anything in its stead, or as a substitute for it. The Declaration of Faith, published by this Synod, contains doctrines plainly revealed in the Bible, and so far as the Augsburg Confession agrees with the Bible, so far it agrees with our Declaration."

He said further, "We do hereby again declare that we do not receive and adhere to the Augsburg Confession, complete, entire and in all points of doctrine. Some are manifestly unscriptural. That Confession inculcates baptismal regeneration; private absolution: baptism as a saving ordinance: the real body and blood of Christ present in the Holy Supper."

They also read in evidence from a religious newspaper, published in Fort Plain, by a Committee of the Franckean Synod, an extract from a sermon preached in 1831 by Rev. George B. Miller, a Professor in the Hartwick Theological Seminary, who said speaking of the authority of the creeds, "Another course is sometimes pursued: that is, to take the words of the creed, not in the bona fide sense which they were meant to convey, but as they may be explained: or ought I not rather say, tortured to mean? To exemplify my meaning, let me refer you to the Augsburg Confession. No one competent to judge will deny that it contains the two following propositions, that no one who should die without having received baptism can be saved—and that in the Lord's Supper, we actually, not symbolically or figuratively, but actually receive the body and blood of Christ: the same body that was slain, the same blood that was shed on the cross. Now few of our ministers, and few of our people I am bold to say, in this country at least, hold such a belief. Yet such is the language and meaning of the Augsburg Confession.

To say that the words may be understood differently is only to say that the Augsburg Confession is not in all its parts the creed of many who yet call themselves Lutherans, and I candidly acknowledge that I am one of that number."

(Dr. Miller changed his views on this subject later, and taught that the Augsburg Confession properly interpreted express the true doctrines).

The defendants then proceeded to give the testimony of witnesses.

Martin Shafer, Henry France, Andrew Loucks and David France then testified that they were present at the consecration of the New Rhinebeck church, mentioned by Martin Simmons, a witness of the plaintiffs, at which Rev. Mr. Krotz officiated, and they did not hear anything about the Augsburg Confession.

Rev. David Ottman testified that he was forty-five years of age and a member of the Franckean Synod. According to the history of the Lutheran Church it had never formally received the Augsburg Confession, nor was it the practice of the Lutheran Church in this country to require a belief in it on admission, unless it be in the Tennessee Synod. He also said Mr. Wieting preached the same doctrine as before the foundation of the Franckean Synod. Members on being admitted to these two churches were not required to profess a belief in the Augsburg Confession—they learned Luther's Catechism and were questioned upon it.

Rev. John D. Lawyer was presented as a witness and examined. He was licensed in 1825 and ordained in 1827 by the New York Ministerium. He was not required at his ordination to profess his belief in the Augsburg Confession. The Hartwick Synod united with the General Synod by resolution—it was not done by the churches in their individual capacity. He believed that all the members of the Franckean Synod were Trinitarians. The witness drew his own call as pastor of the Lutheran Church at West Sandlake, in which there was a reference to the Augsburg Confession. He thought the Franckean declaration of faith of 1837, defective, in not fully stating the distinction in the Godhead."

Peter Brown and Peter S. Cross testified to hearing a conver-

sation in August, 1837, between Mr. Seveatman, one of the defendants, and Dr. Möeller, in which the latter said, "we do not adhere to, or believe in the Augsburg Confession any further than you do—we believe just alike," and that Dr. Möeller did not believe the articles on Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

The complainant's witnesses were examined in September, 1840, and in March and April 1841. The defendant's witnesses were examined in June, 1842.

The parties having rested, the cause was argued by Samuel Stevens, Esq., of Albany, for the plaintiff's, and by Henry Hamilton, Esq., of Schoharie, and Marcus T. Reynolds, Esq., of Albany, for the defendants.

The points made by the counsel for the plaintiffs were chiefly the following :

1. The property in question was devoted to the support of the gospel ministry, according to the tenets of the Evangelical Lutheran faith.

2. The Creed, or leading doctrines of that faith are declared and set forth in the Augsburg Confession of faith.

3. The defendants obtained possession of the property in question by accepting the office of trustees, to apply it to and for the uses, purposes and objects of the support of that particular faith or doctrine, and are bound so to apply it. It is proved that the defendant, Mr. Wieting, was employed as one holding that faith.

4. The doctrine or faith of the Franckean Synod established and adhered to by the defendants and others, is a departure from the essential articles of faith of the Lutheran Church as declared, promulgated and taught by the Augsburg Confession, as follows,

(a.) In regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, the Augsburg Confession speaks of the Trinity as three persons—the Franckean declaration of faith, of three *names*, and is the same as taught by the Unitarians.

(b.) The Augsburg Confession declares the equality of the Son to the Father in power and glory. This is not declared in the Franckean creed.

(c.) The Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession expresses

the divine presence in the Lord's Supper, in the same language and sense which our Saviour used when he instituted it, and gave the bread and wine to his disciples. The Franckean Synod treat it as merely commemorative, like the celebration of the Fourth of July.

(d.) The disruption from the Hartwick Synod could only be effected by the unanimous consent of all the members of these churches. Their right of appeal could not thus summarily be cut off.

(e.) There are other new doctrines, to which the defendants pervert these funds. They are Abolitionists, and they require a temperance pledge from their ministers. What right have the defendants to interpolate these motions as a part of the creed or government of these churches? If they had remained in the Hartwick Synod, could they expel or excommunicate a member for refusing to join against the South, or for refusing to sign the pledge?

(f.) The appropriation by the defendants of the property which they thus held in trust, to the support of the faith, and to promulgate the doctrines of the congregations adhering to the Franckean Synod, is a violation of the trust reposed in them, and of their duty as such trustees, and a misapplication of the trust fund, which entitles the complainants to relief in equity. It makes no difference that the property was contributed by various persons and in small sums. There is no conflict in the testimony as to what these churches were, until Mr. Wieting came among them. They were Lutheran churches, holding to the Augsburg Confession. There is a trust in this property for the support of that Confession which a Court of Equity will enforce.

(g.) The defendants should be removed as trustees and required to account for the trust property misapplied by them, and they and those who have succeeded them as trustees, (if any) should be restrained from diverting the trust property from the objects and purposes of the trust as originally created.

(h.) The defendants should be decreed personally to pay the complainants the costs of this suit.

Henry Hamilton, Esq., of counsel for the defendants presented the following points, viz. :

1. That the Augsburg Confession has never been adopted as the standard of faith of the Lutheran churches in the United States. The German Protestants were not known as a Lutheran Church until 1537, or later. The Augsburg Confession had been in the meantime altered by Melancthon.

2. The ministers and members of the Lutheran churches generally in the United States are not required to subscribe to, or profess their belief in the Augsburg Confession, as to all the doctrines contained in the twenty-one articles of the Confession. The Ohio and Tennessee Synods are the only exceptions.

3. The question whether or not the defendants are orthodox, can only be determined by the proper ecclesiastical tribunal, and cannot be decided by this court.

4. The deed from Mr. Somner and others to Johannes Shaver and others, in trust for the congregation of Cobleskill and New Durlach is absolute and unconditional, and founded on a valuable consideration paid, and the church or congregation have a right to use or dispose of the property thereby conveyed for any lawful purpose.

5. Parol evidence is inadmissible to show that such deed was given upon any other trust or condition than what is expressed in it.

6. There is no proof that the consideration money mentioned in the deed, or raised to build the two church edifices, was raised or paid on condition that the Gospel was to be preached or the Sacraments administered according to the Augsburg Confession.

7. Neither the formation of the General Synod, nor the adoption of a new form of church government, nor the adoption of any declaration of faith since March 9th, 1789, the day of the date of the deed, can in any manner impair or prejudice the rights of the defendants acquired under that deed.

8. The adoption by the General Synod of the "Formula," was an innovation upon the ancient and acknowledged usages, government and discipline of the Lutheran churches in the United States.

9. The act of the General Synod, in passing a vote of censure on the Franckean Synod, (which was not then a member of the

General Synod) was *ex parte*, without jurisdiction and void and not properly authenticated to the court.

10. The complainants are confined to the specifications or particulars in which they allege in their Bill the defendants have seceded from the Augsburg Confession, and cannot show that the defendants have departed from it in other particulars. Those specified are the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ and Original Sin.

After hearing the arguments, the Assistant Vice-Chancellor, Hon. Lewis H. Sanford, rendered his decision in a written report, covering seventy pages, octavo, in the column of reports. It is difficult to give a digest of his opinion in a limited space. He states that these churches in Sharon and New Rhinebeck, together with one in Cobleskill, were in existence as early as 1787, and probably organized many years before. In 1713, one hundred and fifty families of the Palatine immigration settled in Schoharie county, and they were known as Lutherans. On the 9th of March, 1789, Rev. Mr. Somner and others, conveyed one hundred and fifty acres to the trustees of these three churches, and said in the deed, "for the common use and benefit of the said Lutheran congregation forever." A church edifice was built at New Rhinebeck in 1738, and one at New Durlach, or Sharon, in 1799. The former became incorporated in 1798, and the latter in 1808. In the same year the Cobleskill congregation was set off from the other part and awarded fifty acres of the land, and the Sharon and New Rhinebeck churches continued to form a pastorate up to the time of the commencement of the suit. The New York Ministerium was formed in 1796, and prior to 1820 both of these churches were united with it. Mr. Møeller was then pastor from about 1806 until 1821 or 1822—Mr. Crownse from 1823 to 1828, and the defendant, Mr. Wieting from that time until now. In 1820 the General Synod was formed. In 1830 the Hartwick Synod was formed out of the New York Ministerium, and these two churches, with no dissent, attached themselves to the Hartwick Synod and became part of it. Mr. Wieting as pastor of these churches participated in the organization of the Hartwick Synod and its union with the General Synod, and continued in connection with them un-



til 1837, when acting with a majority of the congregations in both churches, and with a majority of the trustees and church councils of each church, severed their connection with the Hartwick Synod and the General Synod of the United States, and uniting with several other congregations, dispersed through the central part of the State, formed a new Synod, which in honor of one of the most distinguished Lutheran divines of the last century, they denominated the Franckean Evangelic Lutheran Synod, and they adopted and published a Constitution, in which they set forth among other things, their declaration of faith, and their system of church government and ordinances. In 1838, this new Synod adopted an amended Constitution, containing their system and declaration of faith in somewhat different terms from that published in 1837.

The two churches in question, under the control and direction of the defendants, continue their connection with the Franckean Synod. The complainants, who are members of these churches, and one of them a Trustee, adhere to the Hartwick Synod.

Next the Vice-Chancellor spoke of the principles which govern Courts of Equity in cases of this kind. He said, "They proceed upon the ground of *a trust* and their aim is to ascertain its scope and objects and to enforce its proper and faithful administration. The jurisdiction is environed with greater difficulties than that over the ordinary private trusts which come under our review, by reason of the uncertainty which prevails, as to the precise objects and intentions of the donor. The inquiry often arises after a great lapse of time, when no living witness can inform the conscience of the court, and when its search for truth must be made in history, and in the controversial writings of contemporaries of the donors. The course of the administration of the trust, and its alleged perversion, are also frequently shrouded in mystery and involved in the subtleties of polemics and theology. Still the court is bound to exercise its control over these charitable funds as well as over the less difficult class of private trusts."

He reviewed a number of leading cases bearing upon the question at issue. In an English case, the case of *The Attor-*

*ney General vs. Pearson*, (3 *Merivale Reports*, 352) Lord Eldon decided that when it appears to have been the intention of the founder of a trust for religious worship, that a particular doctrine should be preached, it is not in the power of the Trustees or the congregation to alter the designed objects of the institution.

He also cited the case of *The German Reformed Church in Forsyth Street, N. Y.*, (10 *Parge's Reports*, 627) where the complainants alleged a perversion of the temporalities of the church by the defendants, in two particulars, viz., a severance of the church from its spiritual union with the Dutch Reformed Churches, which union existed when the trust funds were bestowed, and also the teaching of Arminian or Lutheran doctrines, instead of the Calvinistic doctrines of the German Reformed Church. On both grounds the Chancellor sustained the Bill, and decreed a restoration of the church property, maintaining the original faith, doctrines and government of its founders.

He also cited the case of *Lady Hewley's Charity*, (*Attorney General vs. Shore*, 7 *Simmons Reports*, 309) in which the charity was created for the benefit of Protestant dissenters, who believed in the doctrine of a Trinity. When it was shown the court that for several years preceding, a majority of the Trustees professed Unitarian opinions, although they called themselves Presbyterians, and that they had applied a considerable portion of the income in the education and support of Unitarian preachers; the court decreed that persons professing Unitarian views be excluded from participating in the benefit or administration of the charity.

In concluding his inquiry on this second point he said, "The questions which I have to consider are,

1. Whether the property in question was held upon the trust alleged in the Bill.
2. Whether there has been any breach of such trust.
3. If there has, whether the complainants are entitled to be relieved against such breach of trust in this suit."

The Assistant Vice-Chancellor then went into an examination of the points at issue between the parties, in which he re-

viewed the testimony of witnesses and church authorities, including the Lutheran church historian, Louis Veitvon Seckendorf in his history published in 1694—Dr. Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History—Walchius' *Bibliotheca Sacra*—Milner's Church History—Guericke's Church History—Rev. George Lochman's "History, Doctrine and Discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," (Harrisburg, 1818)—Schmucker's Elements of Theology (1834)—Rapp's History of all Denominations in the United States—the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge and the Encyclopedia Americana. The result of his inquiries on this point he states as follows: "It did not appear that any Lutheran Synod or church in the United States, except the Franckean Synod had adopted any Formula or Declaration of Faith in lieu of the Augsburg Confession, or in effect a substitute for it, or in any manner variant from it, or had repudiated or publicly denied the authority of any of the Doctrinal Articles of that Confession. \* \* \* Thus it appears from the origin and history of the Lutherans, and the concurrent and overwhelming testimony of theological writers and ecclesiastical historians, that the Augsburg Confession of Faith was one of the principal symbols, and declared their doctrines, articles of faith and rules of discipline from the year 1530, until long after the endowment of the churches in question."

Next he reviewed the evidence, as bearing upon the question of its actual adoption by these churches. His conclusion was: "I find that these churches were founded as Evangelical Lutheran churches by the descendants of Lutherans, who fled from Germany to avoid religious persecution: that for more than two centuries prior to their foundation, the Augsburg Confession of Faith had been one of the principal, and the first in rank of the Symbolical Books and standards of the doctrines of that denomination of Christians: and that no other or different Symbolical Books are shown to have been recognized or known among the Lutherans who endowed these churches, or in any of the Lutheran congregations which then existed in this country or in Europe. All this is established by the concurrent testimony of every historian, and of every theologian who has written on the subject prior to 1830, so far as my own

researches, aided by the great learning and untiring diligence of the counsel in the case have enabled me to discover. \* \* \* It is therefore established that the Augsburg Confession of Faith was accepted and received by the churches in question at the time of their endowment, and by the members thereof, as their confession of faith, and the churches were founded for the purpose of having the faith and doctrines expressed in that confession, taught and inculcated therein, and that in respect of the doctrines in question in this suit, there never had been any established or even known dissent from the Augsburg Confession, in this or any of the Lutheran churches."

The next point in the inquiry was whether the defendants had departed from the faith of the Augsburg Confession on the doctrines of the Trinity, the divinity of Jesus Christ and the effects of original or inherited sin. This inquiry the Court measured by the Franckean Declaration of Faith.

On the doctrine of the Trinity, the Assistant Vice-Chancellor quoted the early confessions of the Christian Church, the Augsburg Confession, the Thirty Nine Articles of the Episcopal Church, the Westminster Confession, the Canons of Dort and the creed of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

He also cited the creeds of the Unitarians, the Universalists and of the Christians, and he came to the conclusion that the article in the Franckean Declaration of Faith fell short of being a Trinitarian Creed. He also found that it was wanting in expressing the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and that it had abandoned the Lutheran doctrine on Original Sin.

He said, "The complainants have therefore in my opinion, established that the defendants have adopted a rule or standard of faith, which is different from the Augsburg Confession of Faith, and the other standards of faith and doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as held and maintained by the founders of the two churches in controversy, and that they have diverted the churches and church property from the purposes and objects for which they were erected and bestowed, and perverted them to the preaching, teaching and support of an essentially different faith and doctrine, in violation of their duty as Trustees of that property and those edifices."

In regard to the severance of the churches from the Hartwick Synod the Court said: "The inquiry remains whether the synodical connection was indissoluble without the consent of all the parties on both sides: or was separable by the act of a majority of those entitled to a voice in the government of the two churches, against the wishes of a minority, and without the consent of the other constituent members of the Synod. The decision of the Chancellor in the *German Reformed Church case* (*Gable vs. Miller*, 10 *Paige's Reports*, 645) before cited, appears to establish that the attempt of the defendants to cast off the authority of the Hartwick Synod, was a departure from their duty, and the founders of the Franckean Synod seemed to have entertained the same opinion of such a secession, for they make it irregular for any minister or church to withdraw from the Synod without a regular dismissal therefrom. (*Art. 6, Sec. 2.*) I prefer however to rest my decision on the more important points relating to the faith and doctrine of these churches."

The Court further said: "The Courts in their jurisdiction over these religious trusts, do not interfere with the right which every man has to interpret the word of God according to his view of its plain import. They fetter no man's conscience: they bind no one to the dogmas of a creed, ancient or modern. The defendants by the decree which I am required to make are not restrained from believing or rejecting, as much or as little, of the Augsburg Confession of Faith as they deem reasonable or proper. If they consider it antiquated, obsolete, or contrary to Scripture, they are at liberty to hear and preach accordingly. But the law does not permit them to use the property of others to sustain their views. They are Trustees of this fund, and neither justice nor honesty will tolerate them in taking the fund given by others (their ancestors it may be) and using it to attack and destroy those doctrines."

Lastly the Court inquired whether the complainants were entitled to any relief in the suit, by reason of the defendant's breach of trust, and the nature and extent of the relief.

He said: "In the case of *Gable vs. Miller*, (10 *Paige's Reports*, 627), the Chancellor decreed, that the complainants who had been elected trustees, but by a minority of the church, were the

true and legitimate Board of Trustees, and that the defendants who had introduced Lutheran ministers into a German Reformed church, and were chosen trustees by a majority of the congregation, who approved that course, should deliver up the property in controversy and no longer intermeddle with the same. The decree also provided for an account of the rents and income of the church property."

In that case the defendants proved that the Lutheran clergymen employed in that Reformed church, instructed the church and people from the Heidelberg Catechism, but the Chancellor exposed the fallacy of that ground of defense.

In the case of *Lady Hewley's Charity* (11 *Simons*, 592), the Vice-Chancellor of England decreed that the defendants be removed from being trustees of the charities, and referring it to a Master to appoint proper persons to be trustees in their room, and to take an account of the rents and profits of the charity estates received by the defendants.

As a conclusion of the whole matter, a decree was entered by direction of Assistant Vice-Chancellor Sandford, that it was adjudged that the declaration of faith adopted by the Franckean Synod was essentially different from the standard of faith taught by the Augsburg Confession—that the act of the defendants in teaching that declaration of faith was a perversion and a diversion of the church property—that the severing of the two churches from the Hartwick Synod was illegal and void—the trustees, except Markus Brown, one of the complainants, were removed from office—a Master was directed to be appointed to superintend an election for new officers, to be adherents of the Augsburg Confession and the Hartwick Synod—the defendants were to account to a Master for the use of the property!—the defendants, except as to the two church corporations, were adjudged to pay the costs of the suit, and the members of the two churches who adhered to the Franckean declaration of faith were enjoined from intermeddling or hindering the complainants in the use of the temporalities of the two churches.

There was no appeal by the defendants from the decision of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor and the two churches resumed their connection with the Hartwick Synod. The members who

adhered to the Franckean Synod withdrew and established the Gardnersville church.

The Franckean Synod was unfortunate in having their declaration of faith formulated by Rev. John D. Lawyer, who was a leading spirit in the organization—their first President, and who was afterward expelled from their body for unsound views on the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ, and who died in the ministry of the Unitarian Church. There is no reason to believe that any of the ministers of the Franckean Synod, except Mr. Lawyer, were unsound in their views on the Trinity or the Divinity of our Lord.

In 1864 the Franckean Synod, at York, Penn'a, applied for admission into the General Synod. In making their application they had followed the directions of the President of the General Synod, but which did not meet the constitutional requirements. They were received on the condition that at their next annual session they adopt the doctrinal position of the General Synod—this they did—and thus they became an integral part of that body and they remain so until this day.

---

## ARTICLE V.

### DESCENSUS AD INFEROS.

By PROF. L. A. FOX, D. D., Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

Christ's Descent into Hell is kept prominently before the Christian public by the article in the Apostles' Creed. In many of our churches it is repeated every Lord's Day, as well as at every baptism. The devout worshiper is forced to form some conception of its meaning, and the mere spectator is struck with the language. These facts give it a greater relative importance. The assaults of Rationalism have, in the reaction, drawn more attention to it from scientific circles. In the growing opinion that all probation does not end at death, men have turned to this doctrine for light. The interest that is felt in it is manifested in various ways.

Numerous questions are awakened by this article of the creed: Is it an important truth, or is it a comparatively insignificant



fact thus stated? What does it mean? Did Christ descend into the place of torment, or simply into the invisible state, or merely into the grave? Was it his divine influence, or his soul, or his entire person that descended? Has the article more than one possible interpretation, and if so, which one has the best Scriptural warrant? What special interest have we in it either as a source of consolation, or of a power of holy living, or of revelations of the possibilities of the future world? If true, ought it to have a place in a brief confession used largely in devotion? These and many similar questions are asked and answered in different ways. While uniformity as to the language of the article is largely preserved, there is great diversity as to the interpretation. We find some want of uniformity among Lutherans. A large majority say, "He descended into hell," yet one liturgy has substituted an interpretation and says, "He descended into the place of departed spirits." Discussion in the right spirit is eminently proper, and may not only lead us to clearer conceptions of what may be known about it, but also to the adoption of the same formula.

This doctrine has never been made a test of fellowship. All are agreed that it is not a fundamental one. In those churches where no departure from the prescribed service is allowed, latitude in interpretation is permitted. When interpretations are given they are not regarded as confessionally binding. Such an interpretation is given in the Formula of Concord, but the epitome, after mentioning the points in controversy, adds, "It is enough for us to know that Christ descended into hell to destroy hell for all believers, and that we through him have been snatched from the powers of death and Satan—from eternal damnation and, therefore, from the jaws of eternal death. But how these things were done we should not curiously inquire." As a principle of confession beyond this no part of the Church has ever gone.

The fact is well known that this article was not one of the original articles of the creed. It makes its first appearance in history in Arian creeds,—in those of Ariminum, and Sirmium (359). It appears first in the orthodox Church in the creed as used at Aquileia in 390. When, by whom, or why introduced,

is unknown. It was there previous to that time, for Rufinus says he found it there, and states further that it was neither in Roman nor Oriental creeds. He supposed that it was the equivalent of the Roman *sepultus*. Bishop Burnet remarks, that "as there was no other article in that symbol that related to Christ's burial, so the words which he gives us, he descended into the lower parts (*descendit ad inferna*), do very naturally signify burial."\* But Schaff says Rufinus "misunderstood it."† Carey says that "the word *sepultus* also is in the Aquileian creed, and is given by Rufinus as a part of the creed expounded; so in Bingham it is thus: *sepultus et descendit ad infima*. Unless therefore we come to the conclusion that *sepultus* was inserted in the time of Rufinus, it seems difficult to reconcile what he has said of the descent in *inferna* taking the place of buried in other creeds with the only version of the creed now extant."‡

Admitting the fact that this article was adopted from the creed of Aquileia, which is most probably true, and also that there it was the equivalent of "buried," which is barely probable, it does not follow that we must discard it, or that we must hold it as having less authority because of these facts than the other articles. The speciousness of the argument based on the history is destroyed as soon as we remember that the creed was a growth. It did not appear in its completed form until near the close of the eighth century. The argument covertly assumes that the authority for faith in any article of the creed is the antiquity of its place in it. But the only authority for a doctrine is the Scriptures. No article is to be accepted or rejected because it was held or not by the Church of the first three centuries after the apostles, but alone because it is taught or not in the word of God. Without forgetting or yielding in the slightest degree this Protestant principle, it is profitable to observe that whatever may have been its meaning as first used at Aquileia, the expression, *descendit ad inferna*, when incorporated in the creeds of other churches did not mean "was buried." This is evident from the fact that it was added to

\*Thirty-Nine Articles.

†Creeds of Christendom, Vol. I., y. 46.

‡Testimony of the Fathers.

sepultus. It is further evident from the fact that the Church Fathers believe that Christ went after death into the world of spirits and expressed this idea in the words of the creed. Gerhard says: "This doctrine that Christ descended into hell was generally received among the ancients of the first three centuries, and it was distinguished from his death and burial."\* This statement may easily be confirmed. Tertullian says (*De Anima* c. 7): "To what did Christ, having died, descend? I think to the souls of patriarchs." Again, (*De Anima*, c. 55): "Christ, who is God and also man, having died according to the Scriptures, and been buried according to the same, and hence having satisfied the law, having passed (*functus*) the form of death *apud inferos*, did not ascend into the higher heavens before he had descended into the lower parts of the earth (*in inferiora terrarum*) that he might there make the patriarchs and prophets perfect." Irenæus says: "Since our Lord departed into the middle of the shadow of death, where the souls of the dead were, and then afterwards rose again in his body, and after his resurrection ascended into heaven, it is manifest that the souls of the disciples, for whom the Lord underwent these things, will depart into an invisible place appointed for them by God, (v. 31). Origen says: "With his soul without body he went among the souls that were without bodies." (*Ad. Celsum*, II, §41). Epiphanius says: "His body was buried in truth and remained three days without a soul and breath and motion, and was wrapped in fine linen, and deposited in the grave shut by a stone with a seal set on it, but his divine nature was not enclosed or buried but descended with his holy soul to the lower parts of the earth and brought thence the souls that were in captivity." Athanasius is quoted by Mombert† as saying: "By his body he lay in his grave, by his soul he went into hell and vanquished death." So universal was this opinion that Augustine said that only unbelievers denied that Christ was *apud inferos*. Gerhard observes "that what pertains to the nature and circumstances and the end of the descent they did not all explain in the same way. Many not only referred it to the

---

\**Loci*, vol. vi., p. 79.†*Evan. Review*, 1859.

state of humiliation, but also restricted it to the soul of Christ. Others believed that the soul penetrated the seat of Tartarus and even to the place of the damned, and delivered those from chains and torments bound there. Others asserted that he delivered only those who believed that he was about to come.\* The ancient Church in incorporating this article into the creed did not intend, therefore, simply to state the fact that he was buried. But was it intended to set forth nothing more than that he was really dead, and that his soul was not dead or asleep while his body was in the grave? Muensches, in an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (1859), frequently noticed, leaves the impression that this is at the present time at least the chief purpose of the article. He sums up the results of his study in five points: "1. The soul of man does not die nor sleep. 2. There is no intermediate place. 3. That our Saviour had a human soul. 4. That he really died, since there was a separation of his soul and body. 5. Idle and unprofitable questions as to Christ's descent into Hades are precluded." Whether this be true in itself or not, the Fathers meant more. "If, then," says Clemens Alexandrinus, "our Lord went down into hell for no other purpose than to preach the Gospel, he therefore went down to preach to all, or to the Jews." "The Lord God descended to them that he might preach the Gospel (evangelizaret) and make known in a joyful message his salvation," says Justin Martyr. "He descended into hell that he might set free the just," says Cyril of Jerusalem. "He descended into hell that he might there make the patriarchs and prophets perfect," says Tertullian. Perhaps without a single exception they believed that Christ descended into hell to perform some mission to the dead. It must be admitted that their language and opinions were most akin to, and were the germs that were afterwards developed into, the Romish doctrine.

There are four leading interpretations of this article of the creed: the first is based mainly on its history, and finds in it chiefly his burial; the second is based on Psalm 18 : 5, and finds his intense suffering; the third is based on Acts 2 : 27 chiefly, and finds only his departure in soul into the world of

\*Loci, vol. vi., p. 79.

spirits; the fourth is based chiefly on 1 Pet. 3 : 18, 19, and finds that the entire person went into the place of torments or into hell proper.

1. It is synonymous with sepultus. This was the interpretation of Rufinus, and has been repeatedly revived. Under this division falls the *Presbyterian*. This is really the interpretation given in the Westminster Catechism.\* "Christ's humiliation after death consisted in being buried and continuing in the state of the dead and under the power of death till the third day, which hath been otherwise expressed in these words, He descended into hell." The attention is kept upon the body by this language, *Buried and continuing in the state of the dead*. Its meaning plainly is that he was buried and remained buried till the third day. Dr. Hodge,† the greatest of modern Presbyterian theologians, quotes the Catechism and argues "that this is the correct view" from "the original and proper meaning of the Greek word *ᾠδης*," and "the fact that these words were not in the creed originally." Yet Dr. Hodge in criticising the interpretation of Calvin finds that "the natural exegesis of the words immediately preceding it" requires more than the idea of burial. This is his own rendering: "He was crucified, dead, buried, descended into sheol, *i. e.*, he passed into the invisible state." So, he several times, when speaking of the soul of Christ, uses the expression "the invisible state" as the equivalent of continuing under the power death. With all due deference to his great ability one cannot but express his dissent. While endorsing the Catechism he gives another interpretation to the creed. That we do not misinterpret the Westminster Confession may be seen in the fact that it is only a slightly changed form of statement of an older opinion from which it was manifestly drawn. Turretin says‡ that Zanchius, Piscator, Pierius and others taught that it pertained to his burial and detention three days in the grave.

This interpretation is wholly unsatisfactory. Continuing un-

\*Larger Catechism, question 50. †Systematic Theology, vol. ii., p. 616.

‡Alii ad sepulturam et triduanam ejus in sepulchro detentionem pertinere contendunt, ut Zanchius, Piscator Pierius et alii.—*Opera*, Tom. 11, p. 317.

der the power of death is not by any means the same as "descended into hell." It was not so understood among the Fathers; it has never been generally so understood. *Ad inferos*, *ᾗδης*, *sheol*, in this connection, as they usually do elsewhere, must refer to something beyond the grave. "It is," says Turretin, "a tautology barely endurable in so succinct and brief a symbol." If this is the meaning it ought to be omitted altogether. What is the use in saying, He died, was buried, and remained dead and buried until he was raised from the dead and the grave?

2. This interpretation finds in the article of the creed the agonies of Christ *ante mortem*. This is the *Calvinistic* view. There is some doubt about the opinion of Calvin. He is represented by some as holding, as Nicolaus of Cusa in the preceding century did, that Christ suffered in the place of torments the miseries of the damned. This is denied by many, and the words quoted do not justify such an interpretation. Schaff and others say that he held that the descent into hell was prior to Christ's death and is only figuratively descriptive of his mental agony. Turretin specifies Calvin, Beza, Danæus as those who interpret it as *spirituales angores et cruciatus gehennales Christi*.

This interpretation has been embodied in the Heidelberg Catechism.\* "Why is it added, He descended into hell? Ans: That in my greatest temptation I may be assured that Christ, my Lord, has, by his inexpressible anguish, pain and terrors, which he suffered in his soul on the cross and before, redeemed me from the anguish and torment of hell."

To this interpretation of the creed it is a fatal objection that the connection positively forbids it. Standing between his burial and resurrection it cannot refer to anything prior to his death. However true that his soul suffered the pangs of hell, yet that is not the place in the creed to express it, nor was it so intended by those who formed it. If this is the only proper meaning, let us change its position and modify its language into a fuller and clearer expression of its idea. Such an interpretation is so forced that one is apt to suspect some special reason as influencing it.

---

\*Question 44.

Some Calvinistic theologians seeing the insuperable objections to both the Presbyterian and Calvinistic interpretations as standing alone, attempted to combine them. "It expresses," said they, "the last degree of suffering and humiliation, not only as to the body but also as to the soul, and as the last step of the humiliation of the body was the detention in the grave, and in respect to the soul the dire agonies which it endured, so the article was placed last in order to express the last degree of humiliation whether of the body or of the soul."\*

But this does not escape the objections brought against them separately. It would make the article tautological and more obscure than the things emphasized and to be explained. Nowhere else is such language used to convey this idea.

3. The third interpretation is indefinite and general except that it directs the attention to his soul after death. It renders it, in general language, thus: His soul went into the place of departed spirits. This is the interpretation given in the American Book of Common Prayer and is therefore the interpretation authorized by the *Protestant Episcopal Church* in America. The Book of Common Prayer allows in the rubric the substitution of the words, He went into the place of departed spirits, instead of the usual form, and pronounces them therefore as essentially the same. The *Church of England* gives the same interpretation. The Book of Common Prayer published under Edward in 1552 gave a special interpretation of the general one and read thus: "As Christ died for us and was buried, so also is it to be believed that he went down to hell; for his body lay in the grave till his resurrection, but his soul being separate from his body remained with the spirits which were detained in prison, that is to say in hell, and there preached unto them." Ten years afterwards the explanatory clause was omitted, and the matter was left indeterminate. The Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. at its organization omitted it altogether, but at the request of the bench of English bishops it was inserted, at first within brackets and in italics with the aforementioned accompanying rubric. The brackets were afterwards left

---

\*Turretin's Opera.



out and the italics changed, and the form thus changed received the approval of the Church of England.

This interpretation, He went into the place of departed spirits, decides upon only a few points, viz.: that it was the soul of Christ that descended into Hades, that it was living and conscious, and the place to which it went was into the spirit world, but it leaves unsettled whether it went to heaven, or to the place of torment, or from one to the other and thus to both, or to Limbo; whether it went to preach, or to suffer, or to partake of the blessedness of Paradise. While it is definite in a few things, it is and is intended to be mainly very indefinite. In respect to the general truth contained in the interpretation there is no dispute among orthodox Christians. However much they may differ about the meaning of the article of the creed they all agree that while Christ's body lay in the grave his soul went into the world of spirits.

We have under this general interpretation three special ones. (a.) That his soul went to Paradise. (b.) That his soul went into the place of torments. (c.) That his soul went to Paradise and thence to the place of torments. Each of these have found advocates.

Under this general division falls the interpretation of the *Romish Church*, though in all else than the general statement it is wholly unlike that of the Episcopal Church. The Catechism of Trent says, "Christ being dead, his soul descended to hell and remained there as long as his body remained in the grave, that it must be believed that his soul descended to hell in *re et presentia*." But this general interpretation is greatly changed by the special one. Archbishop Hughes stated plainly and popularly the Romish doctrine in his little catechism: "Where did the soul of our Lord go after his death? Ans: After his death the soul of our Saviour went down into that place called Limbo. What do you mean by Limbo? Ans: By Limbo I mean a place where were the souls of the just before the coming of our Lord who opened to them the way to heaven." The Schoolmen divided the future world into three general departments: Heaven, Hell or the place of torments, and Intermediate places. The intermediate state was supposed to have three subdivisions:

Purgatory, Limbus Patrum, and Limbus Infantorum. The Limbus Patrum was supposed to be the place where the Old Testament saints were detained. These doctrines were adopted by the Romish Church and made the means of explaining Christ's descent into hell. The Limbo into which he is said to have descended is the Limbo Patrum.

That Christ descended to the patriarchs and prophets was the opinion of some of the early Church Fathers. This may be seen from the quotations made from Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem and Epiphanius. This opinion involved that of an intermediate place, and Tertullian, at least, believed that all except martyrs went into it to be freed from defects. "This notion of an intermediate state for the purpose of purification sprang, in the first place, out of a mixture of Persian and Jewish elements and passed over at a later period into the doctrine of Purgatory."\* The opinion of these Fathers became the common doctrines before the eighth century, for in that century Boniface of Germany makes, as one of his specifications, this charge against Clement the Irish missionary that he "taught that Christ in descending into Hades delivered the souls not only of believers but also of unbelievers and idolaters."† This early doctrine and that of the Schoolmen as to Limbus were the elements out of which the present Roman doctrine were formed.

A thorough examination of this Roman interpretation would require a lengthy discussion of the whole doctrine of Purgatory. The two are so closely connected that with the overthrow of the latter the former falls with it. It is enough for the purpose of this article to say that there is no scriptural authority for the interpretation, that the tradition to supply the deficiency is not a unanimous consent of the Fathers, that the conceptions of the Fathers on this subject were not clear, and that the language of our Lord to the thief, and of his prayer on the cross is strongly against it.

4. The fourth interpretation applies the language of the creed to the entire person, and may be denominated the *Lutheran* interpretation. This is a general statement of the principal points

---

\*Neander's Church History, vol. i., p. 654.

†Neander, vol. iii., p. 61.

involved in it. Christ, after his body had been reanimated in the grave, went in his entire person into the place of torments, not for the purpose of suffering but of showing himself victor over death and Satan. It is to be observed that a distinction is made between his revivification and his resurrection. By the latter is understood his reappearance among men. This interpretation looks for its scriptural authority, not to the second chapter of Acts, but primarily to the Epistle of Peter. The character of the men who have believed this interpretation, the exegesis by which it is maintained, and the comfort it affords render it worthy of careful examination.

It would be very difficult to prove that this was the original meaning of the article or that it was the one generally drawn from it in the early Church. The important questions for us are: Can this meaning be fairly drawn from it as it now stands in the creed? Is it taught in the Scriptures? If these can be answered affirmatively there is no sufficient reason for not retaining the words so general and so long employed, and for hesitating to accept this interpretation of them.

It has been called the Lutheran interpretation, yet it is to be remembered that it has never been made a confessional principle. The epitome mentions without any expression of condemnation these questions: "Whether in the soul only or in the divine nature only or in body and soul Christ descended, whether it was done spiritually or corporeally; whether this article must be referred to his passion or to his glorious victory and triumph."\* It is not Lutheran in the sense that one must believe it before he can be an accredited Lutheran.

It must be remembered, also, that there has never been perfect agreement among Lutheran theologians in this interpretation. Luther at first believed that it belonged to the state of humiliation, and explained Psalm xviii. as a prophecy of the pains which Christ was to endure after death in hell. But he afterwards repudiated it.† Later in the days of Luther, Æpinus, professor at Hamburg, revived that opinion. This was opposed by his colleagues but defended by Flaccius who in other

\*Book of Concord, Epitome ix.

†Gerhard's Loci, vol. xii., p. 74.

respects was erratic. John Agricola, Hunnius and Brentius are said by Knapp\* to have held the same doctrine. Other theologians have taught that the soul of Christ was in the unknown place where the souls of all the deceased go. Others, that his soul only went to the place of torments. Others, represented by Mosheim, are quite undecided.

Notwithstanding these facts it is properly called the Lutheran interpretation because it is that authorized by the Symbols, and because it has been taught by our greatest theologians.

The Formula of Concord says: "We believe that the whole person, God and man, after burial, descended into hell, overthrew the powers of hell and took away from the devil all power and strength." This statement involves all the points of the Lutheran interpretation.

There was but one judgment among the great theologians on this subject in the 17th century. Gerhard, Calovius, Lyserus, Hutter, Quenstedt, Hollazius, Baier, and many others all taught the same doctrine.

Baier says :† "The descent into hell must be referred to the beginning of his exaltation. Christ having overcome Satan by his suffering and death showed himself victorious and triumphant, and in both soul and body he exhibited himself to the devil and all the damned as Lord endowed with the highest majesty."

Hollazius‡ is fuller: "The acts or steps by which Christ, having been exalted, exercised more and more the divine majesty communicated to his human nature (*carni*) are (1). The descent into hell," etc. "The descent of Christ into hell is the true, real and supernatural movement by which Christ having been released from the bonds of death and restored to life betook himself in his complete humanity to hell, so that he might show himself the victor of death to wicked spirits and lost men." "Although the descent of Christ into hell was true and real yet it was not physical or local but a supernatural movement. Nor was the movement by successive steps, for it was made *εν πνεύματι*, in the spirit, *i. e.* by the divine power." "The descent was instantaneous." "Christ the Godman descended according to the human

\*Christian Theology.

†Compend Part III., c. 2, § 1.

‡Examin, Part iii., sec. 1, chap. 3.

nature and that complete, consisting in body and soul." "The descent of Christ preceded his resurrection. There is a distinction between the internal and external resurrection. The latter is the coming forth from the sepulchre and an exterior manifestation among men, and is designated in the Apostolic Creed. The former is the vivification itself concerning which Peter speaks in his epistle." "Christ descended into hell, not that he should suffer anything of evil from the demons, but that he might triumph over the demons, and that he might convince condemned men that they had been justly shut up in the infernal prison."

These theologians were followed by Buddæus and others in the next century. In our own century outside of the strictly orthodox Lutheran Church we may mention Van Oosterzee\* as holding the same opinion as to the nature of the descent but dissenting as to its purpose.

The sedes doctrinæ, as they called it, is 1 Pet. 3 : 19, 20. They interpreted other passages in the light of this. The other passages were used as in some degree confirmatory and elucidative, and not as primary sources. This is the language of the passage: Christ died once for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, having been put to death in the flesh, but quickened (*ζωοποιήθεις*) in the spirit (by the Spirit), by which (revivication, or *at which time*) he went (*πορεύθεις*) and preached to the spirits in prison, who had once been disobedient when in the days of Noah the long-suffering of God waited while the ark was being prepared." Let us examine with some degree of patience this passage.

There is something unnatural in the common interpretations. Some torture it into this: Christ was raised by the Spirit, by which Spirit Christ preached unto those men while they lived in the flesh, through Noah, who are now spirits in prison. This was the interpretation of Augustine, if Mombert has copied him correctly. It was the interpretation of Beza from whom so many commentators have taken it. "Christ, says the apostle, whom I have already said was vivified by the power of God, formerly in the days of Noah preached to those spirits who now suffer merited punishment in prison." Others find only this, that his

\*Dogmatics.

soul was kept alive and in this he went and preached. Others have ventured a supposition that no personal presence or preaching is intended but a divine power or influence, through which he was raised, that operated in hell to convince them of the justice of their punishment.

All interpretations of this passage except that which sustains the Lutheran interpretation of the creed detract from the force of *ζωοποιηθεῖς* (made living). Some have said that it means "preserved alive," and this is the usual interpretation whether stated or only implied. If spirit refers to Christ's soul *ζωοποιηθεῖς πνεύματι* must have one of these senses: (a.) The soul was dead and was made living. (b.) It was alive, but was preserved in life. (c.) That it was spiritually quickened. None but soul-sleepers will maintain anything like the first. Christ's soul did not sleep or lose its consciousness while his body was in the grave. What can be the meaning of the last? The soul of a sinner may be made living spiritually but not the soul of the Son of God. The only one left us, with the supposition that spirit means Christ's soul, is that Christ's soul, while his body was dead, was preserved alive. But *ζωοποιηθεῖς* never means preserved alive. Stockius in his *Clavis* thus defines it: "1. Generally. It denotes, to make living, vivificans, vivification in any manner whatever, either by bestowing life in the first instance or by restoring life that had been lost. 2. Specifically. It is attributed to God who both bestows and restores life; specially to the Father, and to the Son not only in respect to himself who is said to have been made alive by the Spirit, *i. e.* to have raised himself through the divinity from the dead, (1 Pet. 3 : 18), but also in respect to others whom he raised from the dead. Figuratively it is attributed to the doctrine of the Gospel which makes living so far as it carries with it the Holy Spirit, who makes alive: (a.) By confirming life and salvation in the believing. (b.) By kindling true life and spiritual joy in the minds of the justified. (c.) By changing the heart of man and by exciting new motives."

Its etymological signification is to make living. This is its scriptural use. It is found in St. John 5 : 21 : "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth (*ζωοποιεῖ*) them so the Son quickeneth (*ζωοποιεῖ*) whom he wills." Again in Rom. 8 : 11 :

"But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken (*ζωοποιήσει*) your mortal bodies." This has reference to the resurrection. Dean Stanhope observes upon it that the apostle "places the privilege of Christians in being restored to life, and such a future, as far excels any advantages possible to be reaped from their continuance in the present life by never dying at all." Again, 1 Tim. 6 : 13 : "I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth (*ζωοποιουντος*) all things." Upon these last words Dr. Whitty remarks, "And therefore is able to raise from the dead them who suffer for him." Again in 1 Cor. 15 : 22 : "As in Adam all die so in Christ shall all be made alive" (*ζωοποιηθησονται*). "The resurrection," says Burkitt, "of all mankind comes by Christ. The wicked shall be raised by his power as their Lord and Judge." Again Romans 4 : 17 : "Before him whom he believed, God, who quickeneth the dead," (*ζωοποιουντος*). Of the eleven times it occurs in the New Testament, in every instance, except one, it has the sense of imparting or of restoring life, either physical or spiritual. In that one possible exception it is said of the grain that it is not quickened except it die, and it is used to explain the resurrection of the dead. The Septuagint also uses this word in the sense of making alive. The few quotations and references made in our Greek Lexicons to classic writers employ it always in this same sense.

This, then, is clearly the meaning of the apostle: that our Lord having been put to death in his human nature was restored to life, and the *πνευματι*, therefore, is not, as some say, the dative of *respect wherein*, as is *σαρκι*, but is the *causal dative*. Our Lord was *not* preserved alive or made living in *his soul*, but was made living *by the Spirit*. But what is meant by Spirit? It is in contrast with flesh, which here manifestly means his human nature and not simply his body, and must refer either to the Holy Spirit or that divine power through which he was raised from the dead. The resurrection of Christ is sometimes ascribed to the Father, once to the Holy Spirit, and the power of raising himself is claimed by himself. Spirit in contrast with humanity, when applied to Christ, usually means his divine na-



ture. We would render these words, "made living by the divine power"—a power which he had in his divine nature in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Were it not for the remaining portion of Peter's language there would be no one to question the correctness of the preceding exegesis. But interpreters differ widely as to the meaning of that part, and they try to construe the whole into one consistent sense.

What is meant by "by the which" ( $\epsilon\upsilon \tilde{\varphi}$ )? Those who hold that the soul of Christ went into the place of departed spirits but not into hell, and those who hold that only the soul went into hell agree in saying that this passage has no reference to the descent into hell or that  $\tilde{\varphi}$  has  $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  for its antecedent. But as spirit cannot here mean his soul this last construction must be rejected. It is very certain that the apostle does not say "in which soul."

If "spirit" means Holy Spirit and is the antecedent of  $\tilde{\varphi}$ , and if the preaching was done after Christ's resurrection and in the place of torments, then we must read "by which Holy Spirit he preached." But as this has never been maintained it need not be discussed. If spirit means the divine nature or divine power, and *is the antecedent of  $\tilde{\varphi}$* , there was either no preaching at all at Christ's resurrection or it was not personal but one of vague, indefinite sort of influence. The last has found no serious advocates, for what could be meant by a "preaching in hell in a divine influence?"

In all these interpretations nothing is left us but to deny either a preaching at the time of the resurrection or that  $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  is the antecedent of  $\tilde{\varphi}$ .

But  $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  is not the antecedent, because (a) A legitimate construction admits another. (b) A consistent and natural interpretation requires another.

There are two constructions, distinct but not essentially different in this case, both legitimate and of frequent use, that preserve the connection of thought, and the one or the other is greatly to be preferred to those constructions which break that connection. The one finds the antecedent of  $\tilde{\varphi}$ , not in any particular word, but in the preceding circumstances, and would

render it: "By which revivification he (Christ in his complete humanity) went and preached." This is a frequent construction. In a casual reading of Homer this line was found: *Πρῶτα δ' ἐγὼν ἐπέσιν πειρήσομαι, ἣ θεμὶς ἐστίν*, which one Greek professor renders: "And first I will try with words, which is right." Buttmann lays down this principle, and furnishes examples: "The relative sometimes refers to an antecedent which is only *implied in the sense* of the main sentence."\* Kuhnner says: "The relative is put in the neut. when it is referred not so much to the substantive alone as to *the whole sentence*."†

The other of these two preferable ones is a still more common construction. One of the regular uses of *ἐν ᾧ* is to point out the precise time and is rendered, *at which time*. This is here the most natural rendering, and expresses not so much the manner as the time of his going. We would render the whole in this way: Christ once suffered for sins, having been put to death in the flesh but made alive in the flesh, at which time he went and preached.

A natural and consistent interpretation renders one or the other of these constructions necessary. The apostle is discoursing of the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ. This construction tells what he did between his revivification and ascension. That was, preached to the spirits. This is a perfectly natural order. But the other interpretations suddenly arrest the discourse and instead of telling what he did after his restoration to life point to what he did through Noah thousands of years before, and then after this long excursus brings us back to the ascension. Does any good writer, any sound thinker make such digressions? If it be said that the remarks about the ark and baptism are a digression and that these interpretations only put the point of departure a little further back, it can be answered that since baptism, of which the ark was a figure, is the means of imparting Christ's life, brought up from the grave, the means of exerting upon us the divine power which raised him from the dead, secures deliverance from hell and makes us participants of his ascension, our interpretation does

\*Robinson's Buttmann's Gr. Grammar, p. 393. †Gr. Grammar, p. 529.

not admit that there is a real digression. This interpretation gathers strength as we proceed. To whom did he preach? To the *spirits* in prison. If the apostle had intended to say, to men in the days of Noah, he took a very indirect and misleading way of doing it. He tells us why these spirits, to whom as spirits Christ preached, were in prison—because they had been disobedient (*απειθῆσασι*). He tells us when they had been disobedient. The particle *ποτε* limits *απειθῆσασι*, and *ὅτε* is used conclusively. They were disobedient in the time of Noah when the ark was being prepared. The reference to the time of Noah has no grammatical connection with the time of the preaching of Christ. It is very difficult to understand how any one ever thought it had.

The prison can be no other than the place of torments. The spirits were disobedient spirits and were confined for the purpose of suffering merited punishment. They were not in the Romish Limbus, for according to the supposition that is the place of the patriarchs and prophets. We know of no prison for disobedient spirits except hell.

If it be asked what he preached to them, unless some inference can be based upon the word *ἐκήρυξεν* we know nothing whatever.

If it be asked why he preached, the Lutheran theologians would answer: "To convince them that they suffered justly." But this is very largely an assumption. Peter says in the following chapter that "the Gospel was preached to them that are dead that they might be judged according to men in the flesh." But this may have no reference to the spirits in prison. But if it be asked what was the general purpose of his descent we do have an answer. It perfected his victory over Satan. From the birth of our Lord Satan had waged a continual warfare against him. He sought to crush him in his infancy. He assumes another attitude and meets him in the wilderness and in three terrible trials seeks to make him his willing servant. Having failed again, he assails him through the populace, sometimes by enkindling an enthusiasm in his favor and sometimes by awakening violent passions against him. Even the disciples are made the unwilling instruments of temptation, as when Pe-

ter received that withering rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan." One more personal effort is made by Satan in Gethsemane when the violence of the conflict made our Lord sweat drops of blood. It was from this trial, and not from death for which he had come into the world, that he prayed in agonizing petitions, "If it be possible let this cup pass from me." He had told the disciples that Satan would come and had nothing in him. Now he says, "Watch," notifying them that Satan was approaching. Having failed once again and in the final personal effort, Satan maddens the people and Jesus is carried amid demoniacal jeers and taunts to Calvary. The Lord of glory is crucified, the Prince of Life is dead. If devils can rejoice, pæans rang through hell over the great victory. But on the morning of the third day the Son of God, raised from the dead, shows himself in all his majesty in Satan's own kingdom, converting the victory into an irreversible defeat. The presence of the conqueror in the heart of the kingdom of the conquered fixed the overthrow. From that hour Satan's power has been limited. His signs and wonders decrease, demoniacal passions very soon disappear, oracles are hushed. It was not then an idle display, the indulgence of an unworthy feeling, but the perfecting of our deliverance from his power that led our Lord to triumph over Satan and his hosts.

This gives us a reason for the specification of the age of Noah. At that time Satan had obtained his greatest power in the world. Only eight souls were free. The human family sank to the lowest degree of depravity. Satan was almost the undisputed lord of the race. Our Lord shows himself triumphant over the highest triumphs of the Devil.

This is the statement of Paul in Ephesians 4 : 8 : "Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high he led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men. Now he that ascended what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens that he might fill all things." This passage confirms the interpretation of Peter.

"He that descended is *the same* that ascended." Christ in his complete person ascended.

His ascent is connected with the descent as somehow dependent upon it. His ascent was in glorious majesty, a triumphant entrance into the "gates and everlasting doors."

He descended into the lower parts of the earth (*κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς*). This may possibly mean the grave, but the supposition of Dr. Hodge that it means the earth is not at all probable. The Jews always thought of hell as beneath. "Brought down to hell," "dig into hell," were familiar forms of expression. Except in highly impassioned language, as in Isaiah, or when the circumstances clearly indicated the grave "the lower parts of the earth" meant among them the invisible state of the dead, or hell. Inferos among the Latins was the same as *κατώτερα*, *κατώτερα μέρη*, among the Greeks.

"To lead captivity captive." To redeem captives from captivity by making captives of the captors. Such is its meaning on the lips of Deborah in Judges. It has its highest significance in the overthrow and binding of Satan who had held so long so large a part of the world in captivity. Christ by his descent into hell overthrew that terrible power and opened up the way for divine gifts and divine ministrations.

This brief review of this passage, is sufficient to show that the most natural rendering tends to confirm the Lutheran view of the descensus ad inferos, and throws light upon the purpose of the descent.

In Colossians 2:15 we have still clearer language. "Having spoiled principalities and powers he made a show of them openly, *triumphing* over them." No interpretation of Peter gives so much force to these words of Paul as that which has been defended in this article. The principalities and powers were, beyond all doubt, Satan and his angels. When did our Lord make a show of them openly, triumphing over them, so fully as when he descended into hell? When read in the light of Peter's epistle they have a depth of meaning that shows that they are parallel.

This doctrine of Christ's descent into hell is not one of mere speculation. It is full of comfort and power for the Christian heart and it well deserves the place given it in our devotional creed.

## ARTICLE VI.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

## AMERICAN.

**BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.**—*Biblical Lights and Side-Lights*, ten thousand illustrations, with thirty thousand Cross-References, &c., by Rev. C. R. Little,—see notice. *The Words of Christ* as Principles of Personal and Social Growth, by Dr. J. Bascom. *Ecce Terra*, or the Hand of God in the Earth, by E. F. Burr, D. D. *Revealed Religion* expounded by its Relation to the Moral Being of God, by H. Cotterell, D. D. *The Seven Last Words*, a Course of Sermons, by S. Baring-Gould. *Creation*, or the Biblical Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science, by Prof. Arnold Guyot. *The Early Prevalence of Monotheistic Beliefs*, by Rev. G. Rawlinson. *Outline of the Doctrine of the Resurrection*, Biblical, Historical, and Scientific, by Rev. R. J. Cooke. *The Lord's Supper Historically Considered*, by G. A. Jacob, D. D. *The Yoke of Christ* in the Duties and Circumstances of Life, by A. W. Thorold, D. D., Lord Bishop of Rochester. *The Public Ministry and Pastoral Methods of Our Lord*, by Wm. Garden Blaikie, D. D., LL. D., Prof. of Theology in the New College, Edinburgh. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, explained by Matthias B. Riddle, D. D. *The Revelation of the Father*, short lectures on the titles of the Lord in the Gospel of St. John, by Brooks Foss Westcott, D. D., D. L. C. *Characteristics of Christianity*, by Stanley Leathes, D. D., Prof. of Hebrew, King's College, London. *History of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Church*, by Edward Reuss, Prof. in the University of Strasburg, translated from the French by D. Hunter, B. D. *The Historical Evidence of the Truth of the Scripture Records* stated anew, with special reference to the doubts and discoveries of modern times, by George Rawlinson, M. A. *Sermons* by the Rev. Phillips Brook.

**SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.**—*The Unity of Nature*, by the Duke of Argyll. *Locke's Theory of Knowledge*, with Notice of Berkeley, (Philosophic Series), by Dr. James McCosh. *On the Difference between Physical and Moral Law*, (the Fernley Lectures of 1883), by Wm. Arthur. *Energy in Nature*, being with some additions, the substance of a course of six lectures upon the Forces of Nature and their Mutual Relations, delivered under the auspices of the Gilchrist Educational Trust, 1881, by Wm. Lant Carpenter, B. A. *A Critical History of Philosophy*, by Asa Mahan—see notice. *Modern Physics*, Studies Historical and Philosophical, by Ernest Naville, Corresponding Member of the Institut of France, translated from the French by Henry Downton, M. A.

**HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.**—*Luther and the Reformation*, the Life-Springs of our Liberties, by Jos. A. Seiss, D. D. *Martin Luther*, a

Study of the Reformation, by Edwin D. Mead. *Japan, Travels and Researches*, by J. J. Rein, Prof in the University of Marburg. *History of Art in Chaldea and Assyria*, by George Perrot and Charles Chipiez, edited by W. Armstrong, B. A., 2 vols. *The Conquest of England*, by J. R. Green. *The Hessians and other German Auxiliaries of Great Britain in the Revolutionary War*, by E. J. Lowell. *Life of Thurlow Weed*, including his Autobiography and a Memoir, by his grandson Thurlow Weed Barnes. *Christianity Triumphant*, its defensive and aggressive victories, by J. P. Newman, D. D. *Life of Goethe*, by Heinrich Düntzer, translated by Thos. W. Lyster. *History of Prussia to the Accession of Frederick the Great, 1134-1740*, by Herbert Tuttle, Prof. in Cornell University. *Peter the Great, Emperor of Russia*, a Study of Historical Biography, by Eugene Schuyler, Ph. D., LL. D.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Life-Thoughts for Young Women*, by M. Rhodes, D. D. *A Book of New England Legends and Folk-Lore*, by Sam'l Adams Drake. *The Chinese Classics*, a translation by Jas. Legge, D. D., of the London Missionary Society, Part I.—*Confucius. The Ethics of the Dust*, ten lectures to little Housewives on Crystallization, by John Ruskin, M. A.

#### GERMAN.

THEOLOGICAL.—*Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie d. Neuen Testaments*. Bern. Weiss, 4. Aufl. pp. 704, Berlin, 1884. *Handbuch der Theologischen Wissenschaften in Encyclopädischen Darstellung*, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Entwicklungsgeschichte der einzelnen Disziplinen, in Verbindung mit Prof. D. D. Cremer, Grau, Harnack (Dorpat) etc. hrsg. von, Prof. Dr. Otto Zöckler, 2. Halbbd. pp. 289-684, Nördlingen, 1882. *Symbolik*. Akademische Vorlesungen. Dr. F. A. Philippi. 1. Hälfte, pp. 240, Gütersloh, 1883. *Confessionelle Lehrgegensätze*. Domcapitul. J. B. Röhm. (I. Thl.) pp. 285, Hildesheim, 1883.

BIBLICAL.—*Hebräisches und chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Wilh. Gesenius, 9. vielfach umgearb. Aufl. von, Prof. F. Mühlau u. W. Valck, pp. xlv, 978, Leipzig, 1883. *Biblischtheologisches Wörterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Gräcität*, 3. sehr verm. u. verb. Aufl. pp. 834, Gotha, 1883. The Clark's have issued a translation of the second edition of this incomparable New Testament Lexicon. The third German edition surpasses the second quite as much as the second edition was an improvement on the first. No student of the original New Testament can afford to dispense with it. Delitzsch's *Commentar üb. die Psalmen* has appeared in the 4th edition. pp. 904, Leipzig, 1883. *Commentar über die Briefe des Petrus und Judas*. Dr. C. F. Keil. pp. 337, Leipzig, 1883. *Hebräische Grammatik* mit Uebungstücken, Literatur und Vokabular, mit Selbststudium, etc., Prof. Lic. Dr. Herm. Strack. pp. 163, Karlsruhe, 1883. *Bruchstücke einer vorhieronymianischen Uebersetzung des Pentateuch*, aus einen Palimpseste der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek



zu Munchen zum ersten male veröffentlicht. Leo Ziegler, pp. vi, xxx, 88, Munich, 1883.

**HISTORICAL.**—*Gottfried Arnold als Kirchenhistoriker.* Beiträge zur Culturgeschichte des 17. Jahrhunderts, Friedr. Flöring, pp. 74, Darmstadt, 1883. *Weltgeschichte.* Leop. v. Ranke, Dritter Theil, Das altrömische Kaiserthum. Mit kritischen Erörterungen zur alten Geschichte, 2 Abtheilungen, 1–3. Aufl. pp. 551, 356, Leipzig, 1883. *Hus und Wiclif.* Dr. Joh. Loserth. Zur Geschichte der hussitschen Lehre, pp. 314, Leipzig, 1884. *Die Revolution von 1848.* Gustav Schlosser, Erinnerungen, pp. 212, Gutersloh, 1883. A little work of absorbing interest. *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils,* J. Friedrich, 2. Bd. pp. xxxv, 458, Bonn, 1883. *S. Gobat,* Evangelischer Bischof in Jerusalem, Sein Leben und Wirken meist nach seinen eigenen Aufzeichnungen, pp. 550, Basil, 1883. *Geschichte des deutschen Volks bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden.* Karl Wilh. Nitzsch, nach dessen hinterlassenen Papieren und Vorlesungen hrsg. von Georg Matthäi, (In 3 Bdn.) I. Bd: Geschichte des deutschen Volkes bis zum Ausgang der Ottonen, pp. xviii, 372, Leipzig, 1883. *Ulrich Zwingli* ein Martin Luther ebenbürtiger Zeuge des evang. Glaubens. Festschrift auf die vierhundertjährigen Geburtstage der Reformatoren zur Beförderung wahrer Union auf dem Boten der Freiheit. Pfr. Jno. Martin Usteri, mit einen Vorwort von Ob-Consist. R. Dr. Frhrn. Herrn. von der Goltz, pp. 144, Zurich, 1883. *Das Armenwesen der Reformation,* Lic. Dr. Bernh. Riggerbach, pp. 56, Basel, 1883. *Die biblische Urgeschichte* (Gen. 1–12: 5) untersucht, Anhang: Die älteste Gestalt der biblischen Urgeschichte, versuchsweise wiederhergestellt, hebräischer Text und Uebersetzung, Prof. Lic. Karl Budde, pp. 539, Giessen, 1883. *Lessing über Toleranz,* Bischof Dr. Jos. H. Reinkens, eine erläuternde Abhandlung in Briefen, pp. 173, Leipzig, 1883. *Geschichts- und Lebensbilder* aus der Erneuerung des religiösen Lebens in den deutschen Befreiungskriegen, Wilh. Baur, I. Bd. 4 Aufl. Agentur des Rauben Hauses, pp. 432, Hamburg, 1884. *Geschichte des Montanismus,* seine Entstehungsursachen, Ziel und Wesen, sowie kurze Darstellung und Kritik der wichtigsten darüber ausgestellten Ansichten, Eine religionsphilosophische Studie, preisgekrönt von der theol. Facultat der Universität zu Berlin, Waldeemar Belck, pp. 86, Leipzig, 1883. *Der Ursprung des Donatismus,* nach den Quellen untersucht und dargestellt, Dr. Lic. Repetent Voelter, pp. 194, Freiburg i. B. 1883. Among the more important Luther Literature may be mentioned: *Dr. Martin Luther* nach seinem äussern und inneren Leben dargestellt, Zum 400 jähr. Geburtstage Luther's, Carl Friedr. Ledderhose, 3. Aufl. pp. 431, Karlsruhe, 1883. *Ein Jahr aus Luthers Leben,* (1525), Vortrag, pp. 41, Heidelberg, 1883. *Dr. Martin Luther's Vorreden* zur heiligen Schrift, pp. xviii, 185, Berlin, 1883. *Dr. Martin Luther's Pädagogische Schriften,* mit einer Einleitung über Luther's Leben und Werke, &c. Reg. u. Schulr. J. Ch. G. Schumann, pp. 356, Vienna, 1884. *Dr. Martin Luther's Trostschriften.* In Auswahl Zusammengesteht und

mit einleitenden Bemerkungen versehen. Archdiak. Paul Rich. Pasig. pp. 107, Oschatz, 1883. *Martin Luther im deutschen Lied*. Altes und Neues. Friedr. Braun. pp. 138, Stuttgart, 1883. *Revolutionär oder Reformator? Was war Luther? Eine Jubiläumsschrift*, Wilh. P. Jonas. pp. 99, Eberswalde, 1883. *Martin Luther in seiner Bedeutung f. das deutsche Volk*, K. Th. Kahlschmidt. pp. 54, Karlsruhe, 1883. *Luther als Seelsorger*. A. Nebe. pp. 127, Wiesbaden, 1883. *Luther's Geistliche Lieder*, with introduction and brief historico-literary notices edited by Alb. Fischer. pp. xxx, 76, Gütersloh, 1883. *Die Wittenberger Nachtigall*. Martin Luther's geistliche Lieder, Jubiläumsausgabe, Karl Gerok. pp. 124, Stuttgart, 1883. *D. Martin Luther's geistliche Lieder* nach seinen drei Gesangbüchern von 1524, 1529, 1545. Ihr Inhalt und Segen, dem Volk erzählt, 1-3. Tausend, Post. Dr. Danneil. pp. 116, Frankfurt, a. M. *Dichtungen*, D. Martin Luther, Hrsg. von Karl Goedeke, mit einem Lebensbilde Luther's von Jul. Wagenmann. pp. lvii, 244, Leipzig, 1883. *Martin Luther als deutscher Classiker* in einer Auswahl seiner kleineren Schriften, 3. Bd., including a table of the life and writings of Luther, besides an index of Vols. I-III, pp. xxviii, 440, Homburg, v. d. H. 1883. *Erfurth's Lutherfest-Almanach*. Zum Besten des Luther-Denkmal's zu Erfurth hrsg. von Dr. Ottomar Lorenz. pp. xlvii, Erfurth, 1883.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Quaestiones de Historia Sabbati*. Lic. Dr. Wilh. Lotz. pp. 108, Leipzig, 1883. The author is a distinguished Assyriologist and the main features of this work rest on Assyriological researches. *Beiträge aus der Seelsorge für die Seelsorge*. Pfr. Dr. C. Hofpred. Windel, 5. Heft. pp. 70, Wiesbaden, 1882. *Commentar zu Kant's Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. Privatdoc. Dr. H. Vaihinger, Zum 100 jährigen Jubiläum desselben, I. Bd. 2. Hälfte. pp. 209-506, Stuttgart, 1882. *Englische Bilder in deutscher Beleuchtung*. Otto Funcke, 2. Aufl. pp. 326, Bremen, 1883. *Die Sage vom ewigem Juden* untersucht, L. Neubaur, pp. 132, Leipzig, 1884.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

MACMILLAN & CO., NEW YORK.

*Literature and Dogma*. An Essay towards a better apprehension of the Bible. By Matthew Arnold, formerly Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford and fellow of Oriel College. Popular Edition. pp. 232. 1883.

The issue of a popular edition of this somewhat notable work just as its clever author was being lionized in this country is what might have been expected. It is a condensation of the original work, made by the author's own hand, a good deal of the apparatus of citation and illustration from

Scripture which originally accompanied it being suppressed. As this edition is intended for the general public, its reduction, the author hopes, "probably improves the book at the same time that it shortens it."

The kind object of *Literature and Dogma*, as stated by Mr. Arnold, "is to reassure those who feel attachment to Christianity but who recognize the growing discredit befalling miracles and the supernatural." By insisting on the natural truth of Christianity its support from miracles may be abandoned. The principal charms of the volume are the author's self-complacency and dogmatic audacity. Christianity is indeed, he holds, mankind's indispensable way, but "theologians and popular religion have given a wrong turn to it all, and present it to us in a form which is fantastic and false." As the form in which the theologians and popular religion exhibit it, is confessedly the form which was derived from the apostles, and which the Church has maintained in its essential features uniformly for nearly two thousand years, Christianity must affect its subjects with marvellous infatuation. Its foremost champions, men of the highest intellectual and moral power, must have been age after age simply a set of fools. The Gospel is not at all what they conceived it to be. At last, however, its true apostle and interpreter has arrived. What he has to present may be gathered from the concluding sentences of his preface to the present edition: "In insisting on 'the miracle of the incarnation' the *Guardian* insists on just that side of Christianity which is perishing. Christianity is immortal; it has eternal truth, inexhaustible value, a boundless future. But our popular religion at present conceives the birth, ministry, and death of Christ, as altogether steeped in prodigy, brimful of miracle;—and miracles do not happen."

*The Story of the Christians and Moors of Spain.* By Charlotte M. Yonge.

Author of "The Heir of Redclyffe," etc. pp. 298. 1882.

One can hardly think it possible that the author of a series of charming "Young Folks'" Histories of England, France, Germany, etc., could write an uninteresting volume on any historical topic. That she should have done this with the romantic "Story of the Christians and Moors" is inexplicable. Possibly the disappointment which the little work occasions is due to the fact that she attempts to bring into combination the history, romance and poetry of these eight centuries of contest between the Moslem and the Christian. To effect this in a volume of 300 pages and make it at the same time a charming book, would require superhuman skill. The result is just what the author admits in her preface "only a compilation to give a surface idea of that strange warfare." As a work of reference it is a valuable acquisition to one's library, for a prodigious series of events are compressed into a narrow compass, but even the romance of Irving will give, at least to the young, a better knowledge of that enchanting chapter of Spanish history.

*Some of Æsop's Fables* with modern instances shown in designs by Ran-

dolph Caldecott from new translations by Alfred Caldecott, M. A. The Engravings by J. D. Cooper. Eighty Illustrations. Demy 4to. Cloth. pp. 79. 1883.

A very attractive book for the nursery table. The translation of the fables possesses a plainness and terseness that reminds students of the original and accords best with the juvenile tastes for which the work is designed. The engravings of the fables are creditable and sure to be relished while the cartoons of "The Modern Instances" are telling satires on English Society and Politics. The whole is printed on stiff card paper.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

*Life of Luther*, by Julius Köstlin. With illustrations from authentic sources. Translated from the German. pp. 587. 1883.

A superb edition of one of the greatest works of the age. Our admiration for Köstlin's Luther is heightened with every reading of it. We do not know in the whole range of biography an example so masterly and so complete. Much as we have studied the great Reformer, in English and German writings, we have never before had the man brought back to us so really, so bodily, so visibly, in his personality, in the attributes and struggles of his inward life and the conflicts and results of his public career. Froude's enthusiastic estimate of the original work as realizing the wishes of Europe for four hundred years proves to be the sober unchallenged judgment of one of the foremost literary men of the day.

A writer in *The Independent* who is recognized as one of the cleverest delineators of public men, in speaking of the great statue of Luther soon to be erected in Washington says: "This magnificent work of art brings him back not more vividly than the minute and comprehensive life just written of him by Julius Köstlin. He gives to the world at last a living Luther, whom death seems never to have touched. We sit with him by the table, we are with him in the garden, we join him in his sports with his children, we laugh at the loving irony of his blunt, sometimes rough, but always honest speeches of his wife, his 'Lord Katie,' as he calls her."

To have succeeded in bringing out such a life of Luther, gives to the author in a certain sense a rank only second to that of his hero. To take the full measure of such a personality and to give a just estimate of the grandeur of his career and a perfect view of the ever-increasing results of his achievements, is no less the product of genius than were Luther's own labors. When Germany, England and America unite in according the warmest tribute of unbounded praise to this volume as worthy of the immortal Reformer, it is certainly but reasonable to predict that it is destined to share his immortality.

The translation is excellent throughout. We have not found a sentence which reminds the reader that he does not have the original. A very attractive feature of this edition is its numerous illustrations reproduced from the original plates. These not only give us the Reformation in the por-

traits of all its leading characters, but these pictures are themselves monuments of the art in that period. Besides these there are a number of *fac similes*, among which are those of a Placard of Indulgences; of the superscription and signature to the Marburg Articles; of a part of the edict of Worms; of the concluding portion of Luther's will, with the signatures of Melancthon, Cruciger and Bugenhagen; and of a letter to his wife, bearing date Feb. 7, 1546.

*Luther. A Short Biography.* By James Anthony Froude, Honorary Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. pp. 90. 1884.

This short biography by the great English historian is really the author's review of Küstlin's great work reprinted from the *Contemporary Review*. It presents in a comprehensive form the chief features of Luther's action and character. It is a book to be read at one sitting. To lay it down before finishing it is next to impossible. It is really one of the most brilliant and fascinating productions extant. Its key-note is contained in the author's prefatory sentence: "Luther's was one of those great individualities which have modeled the history of mankind, and modeled it entirely for good."

*The International Revision Commentary on the New Testament.* Based upon the Revised Version of 1881. By English and American Scholars and Members of the Revision Committee. Edited by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Sacred Literature in the Union Theological Seminary of New York, President of the American Committee on Revision. Vol. VI. *The Epistle to the Romans.* By Prof. M. B. Riddle. pp. 256. 1884.

The successive volumes of this commentary impress us very favorably. The eminent talent engaged in its production shows itself in the scholarly character of the work. The volume before us is marked by high ability. The general introduction, of 27 pages, is very satisfactory. The comments are brief, apt and clear. We cannot, however, accept the Calvinistic interpretation of chaps. viii. and ix. Apart from this, Lutherans will find here the great scheme of redemption well defended. Dr. Riddle says in his preface: "On the eve of celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of Luther's birth, modern scholarship gladly acknowledges that the great Reformer caught the true significance of this great epistle."

*Dr. Martin Luther's Deutsche Geistliche Lieder.*

*The Hymns of Martin Luther* set to their Original Melodies. With an English Version. Edited by Leonard Woolsey Bacon, assisted by Nathan H. Allen. Published in Commemoration of the Four Hundredth Anniversary of Luther's Birthday, 10, 10, 1483. pp. 71.

This handsome book is one of the most excellent of the many memorial volumes called out by the Luther celebration. Luther's hymns were a po-

tent factor in the great work of the Reformation. It has been well said that these hymns "have been to the whole body of Protestant Christians a legacy second only to the noble and vigorous text of his translation of the Bible." This volume contains the only complete collection of them, with the music with which they were from the first identified, that has ever been furnished to English-speaking people. There are thirty-six hymns, printed in the original and the best English versions. The editors and publishers deserve the gratitude of Christians of all denominations, and especially of Lutherans, for furnishing this well-prepared and finely-printed volume. Together with Küstlin's *Life of Luther*, it ought to go into thousands of homes.

GEO. H. ELLIS, BOSTON.

*Martin Luther. A Study of the Reformation.* By Edw. D. Mead. pp. 194.

The "Studies" of Luther and the Reformation, called out by the quarto-centennial celebration, would not be complete without something to remind of the perversions that seek place under the shadow of that great religious revolution. Such reminder is found in the volume before us. This "Study" is from a thoroughly rationalistic standpoint, finding the highest eulogy of the Reformer and the Reformation in what has since been developed as abhorrent to their aim and false to their first principles. The book is well written and bright. It is marked by vigor of thought and grace of style. It abounds in striking, strong, and brilliant passages. It sets forth some features of Luther's character and work with a charming fineness of appreciation and beauty. But it misconceives the great essential and ruling principles of the Reformation as a religious movement. It shows many perversions. It seizes mainly upon the negatives and rejections of the Reformation—its rejections of papal and human authority in religion—and counts them its main positive fruits. True, Luther cleared away rubbish. But he also built grandly. The supremacy of God's word, the great doctrines of redemption and salvation in Christ, the positive side of the Reformation—all this falls out of the appreciation of this kind of "study." Yet we have been much interested in this bright volume. It is very interesting.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

*Commentary on the Revelation.* By Justin A. Smith, D. D., in consultation with James Robinson Boise, Ph. D., D. D., LL. D. pp. 317.

This belongs to the "Complete Commentary" series. The exegetical comments are scholarly and presented with a clearness of style that is highly gratifying. Through the 'general comments' there runs a vein of sound common sense that gives to this very obscure book of the Scriptures a plainness and consistency rarely met with. There is likewise a rich suggestiveness on nearly every page that will lead the reader to enlarge the comments for himself. Dr. Smith was fortunate in having the help of the scholarship of Dr. Boise.

While acknowledging his indebtedness to other commentators, the author has pursued a plan of his own. He here and there takes issue with the interpretation found in most commentaries. As an example, we cite Rev. 6 : 12-17 (pp. 103, 104). He makes these verses refer, not to the end of the world, but to the convulsions and downfall of the Roman Empire. While his reasoning on this point is plausible, it is not as convincing as on some others. He regards Antichrist neither as an individual nor any one political power or organism—not even any one system hostile to the spiritual kingdom of God, like Romanism. It is rather "that deadly force, manifested in all ages, and organizing itself under many imperial forms, by which God's gracious purposes towards men have always been resisted, and are so still." In regard to the second coming of Christ, his interpretations emphatically indicate that it will be post-millennial. The commentary will be a valuable help to the student of "Revelation."

*Harmonic Arrangement of the Acts of the Apostles.* By George W. Clark, D.D., author of "Harmony of the Gospels," etc. pp. 263.

This has the Acts of the Apostles arranged with chronological and explanatory notes, and valuable tables. It is designed for popular use, and has a special view to the wants of Sunday-school teachers in studying this portion of the Scriptures. The author conceived the idea of publishing such a work while preparing, several years ago, his "Harmony of the Gospels." "As the life of Christ can be best gathered," he says, "from the study of the four Gospels in connection, so the lives of Peter and Paul, and the planting and training of the early churches, can be best understood by comparing the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles." This is true, and Dr. Clark deserves high commendation for furnishing Christian readers with such a harmony. It bears evidence of careful preparation throughout. His explanatory notes are concisely given and very excellent, although on some of them we are inclined to offer our dissent. For instance, when Luke speaks of Philippi as "a city of Macedonia, the first of the district," we think he refers to its location with respect to their journey, and not to its rank in importance as Dr. Clark thinks (p. 206). His notes, however, are not intended as a commentary, and the careful reader and teacher will use something more complete; but it will prove an invaluable aid to a satisfactory study of the Acts.

*The Family of the Black Forest.* By the Author of "Old Bristol." pp. 406.

This handsome duodecimo presents a lively tale of the Peasants' War in the sixteenth century. It abounds in very instructive allusions to Luther's doctrine and reformatory work, excels in beautiful descriptions of natural scenery and is characterized by pure sentiment and earnest spirituality. It is just such a book as is wanted by a Baptist family or a Baptist Sunday-school; but there its usefulness ends. Its evident aim is to cast reproach upon Infant Baptism and it is therefore not a fit volume for chil-



dren whose believing parents have brought them into the Christian Church through that ordinance which from the days of the Apostles until now has been universally recognized as the sacrament of admission in the Saviour's fold. The book is illustrated with a number of elegant cuts and its mechanical execution is a great credit to the house by which it was issued.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

*Life Thoughts for Young Women.* By M. Rhodes, D. D., author of "Expository Lectures on Philippians," "Life Thoughts for Young Men," etc. pp. 290.

It was a happy thought in Dr. Rhodes to follow his "Life Thoughts for Young Men" with a similar volume for young women. Both books are composed of lectures delivered to the young people of his congregation in St. Louis, and both give evidence of a full appreciation of their wants. The views presented are characterized by that sound common sense and practical wisdom which we have a right to expect from a faithful and fearless Christian minister, who takes the Bible as his text-book of instruction. Whether Dr. Rhodes speaks of woman's mission, her education, of matrimony, novel-reading, or dress, the same soundness of views pervades all, and makes the book an invaluable companion to every young lady. And just as we would cheerfully and heartily recommend "Life Thoughts for Young Men" to the one sex we would likewise recommend "Life Thoughts for Young Women" to the other. It is sound, practical and helpful, written in a clear and forcible style, and every page has a spirit and freshness at once interesting and exhilarating.

*Service and Hymns for Sunday-Schools.* Published for the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church South. pp. 200.

If the object in the preparation of this book was, to furnish the children of the Southern Lutheran Sunday-schools with an excellent devotional service, and hymns free from the twaddle of so many of the S. S. singing books coming in rapid succession from the press, that object has been successfully attained. With this in use, the children will grow up with a love for the service of God's house and a love for the church-in which they are reared. The work of the committee was discriminating and judicious, and the result is a book for the young unmistakably Lutheran and well adapted for Lutheran Sunday-schools.

FUNK & WAGNALS, NEW YORK.

*Manual of Revivals.* Practical hints and suggestions from Histories of Revivals and Biographies of Revivalists, with themes for the use of Pastors and Missionaries before, during and after special services, including the texts, subjects and outlines of the sermons of many distinguished Evangelists. By Rev. G. W. Hervey, M. A., author of "A System of Christian Rhetoric," etc. pp. 332.

The latitude to which this work is adapted and the quality of its teach-

ings may be recognized by a specimen page: Chapter xvi. treats of "The intrusion of the feeble-minded and the insane." Nine answers are offered to the question, "What shall we do with them?" We are told

"4. Feeble-minded men may occasionally be induced to promise to take no part in a prayer-meeting. If therefore they attempt to do so they may possibly cease, on being reminded of the promise they made.

"5. The interruptions and disturbances caused by monomaniacs, may in some cases be best prevented by adopting the rule of calling on persons by name to pray and exhort.

"7. Forasmuch as mad people very seldom pray, the leader of the meeting may keep them quiet by saying, 'Some brother will now pray; after prayer we will sing this hymn,' and at the moment the hymn is given out, it may be added, 'After singing, another brother will lead in prayer.' If on such occasion, an erratic person rises to exhort or expound, the leader may check him with the reminder that prayer or singing is next in order.

"8. A maniac is usually sung or prayed down. To attempt to eject him from the meeting is dangerous. \* \* If he be requested to lead in prayer, he will commonly come to a speedy end, for usually he dislikes this kind of religious exercise."

This let the reader be assured is not travesty.

Notice another specimen. The author has learned of German theologians "who venture to discuss speculative questions about the future state." He moralizes that "it speaks volumes against their bold conjectures that the church of which they are members is forsaken by the masses of the German people, and that almost all the Lutheran parishes are candidly considered as proper missionary fields for American Methodists and Baptists." Why not also for Presbyterians and Congregationalists? Query: What is the relation between a Manual on "Revivals" and the slandering of the Lutheran Church?

*Pulpit and Grave*: A volume of funeral sermons and addresses, from leading pulpits of America, England, Germany and France. Containing 90 Sermons, Sketches of Sermons and Obituary Addresses; also 450 classified Texts, Scripture Readings, Death-bed Testimonies, points of funeral etiquette, etc., etc. Edited by E. J. Wheeler, A. M. pp. 365. 1884.

Was it not an inspired prediction that led "The Preacher" to declare "of making many books there is no end?" And was it not also with reference to such specimens of the book-making art as the one here named, that he added "much study (of them) is a weariness to the flesh?" The object sought by this volume is to aid pastors in the performance of funeral services—but what a *confessio paupertatis* that pastors should need an aid of this character or find it even when needed to answer its purpose. Beecher's Sermon on "The National Bereavement" and the few obituary addresses from such minds as Dr. Hall, Dr. Cuyler, Spurgeon, Dr. Storrs

and Dr. B. M. Palmer, will of course repay careful study, but if our younger men were to imitate or plagiarize some of these abridged discourses on funeral occasions their services would very properly be called melancholy efforts.

The most valuable part of the work, if it will be put into practice, are the points of "Etiquette in funerals" from Drs. Cuyler, Deems, Wedekind and others.

*Biblical Lights and Side-Lights.* Ten Thousand Illustrations, with Thirty Thousand Cross-References, consisting of Facts, Incidents, and Remarkable Declarations, taken from the Bible; for the use of Public Speakers and Teachers, and also for those in every Profession, who, for illustrative purposes, desire ready access to the numerous Incidents and striking Statements contained in the Bible. By Rev. Chas. E. Little. pp. 636. 1883.

An immense amount of labor must have been bestowed on this large and well-printed volume. But it has been labor well expended. Of all the 'helps' offered to ministers and others, to facilitate reference to illustrative Biblical incidents and passages, this is unquestionably the best yet given. The plan of it is truly unique, the arrangement admirable for quick and easy reference, the topics so comprehensive and varied as to overlook scarcely a single point of doctrinal, ethical or practical truth, and the incidents and quotations most remarkably apt and full. The book will be most serviceable and valuable for the table of the minister, furnishing him, not a chance to escape study and thought, but an aid, stimulating him. A special feature of its value is that it will take those who use it, not to stereotyped incidents and stories that will not bear repetition, but to the facts of God's word which remain ever fresh and full of dignity and power.

*John Foster: Life and Thoughts.* With Copious Index. By W. W. Everts, D. D. pp. 207. 1883.

Dr. Everts has done a most excellent service in compiling this work, with its fine introductory sketch of Foster's life and character. Foster was a remarkable man, with gifts of the highest order. The originality and richness of his intellect are brought clearly to view in this collection of strong, brilliant and salient passages from his writings. Open the volume anywhere and read a page, and you will feel the force of Robert Hall's statement: "His conceptions are most extraordinary and original." The brilliancy is not empty flashes, but the rich light of substantial thought. The book is quickening to intellect and heart—one to have at hand to turn "fragments" of time to profit. Its value is increased by the excellent order of arrangement under which these profound thoughts and striking illustrations are given, and the full index, by which reference to any given subject is made easy. Even those who have Foster's works in full will find this compend a great convenience, for direct and easy reference. The

introductory 'Life and Character' of Foster, is an excellent example of biographical delineation, and gives a clear and impressive conception of his unique and strong personality. It is a fitting introduction to the "Thoughts" of Foster himself.

*Merv: A Story of Adventures and Captivity.* Epitomized from "The Merv Oasis." By Edmund O'Donovan. 25 cents.

*Mumu and the Diary of a Superfluous Man.* By Ivan Turgenieff. Translated from the Russian by Henry Gersoni. 15 cents.

*Memorie and Rime.* By Joaquin Miller. 25 cents.

*Christianity Triumphant.* By J. P. Newman, D. D. 15 cents.

*The Bowsham Puzzle.* By John Habberton. 25 cents.

*My Musical Memories.* By H. R. Haweis. 25 cents.

These are the first of the 1884 series of the "Standard Library." We are gratified that this firm are continuing the good work of furnishing the better class of reading matter at such cheap rates. We hope they will receive encouragement enough to keep on for many years.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON.

*History of Prussia to the Accession of Frederick the Great, 1134-1740.*

By Herbert Tuttle, Professor in Cornell University. pp. 498. 1884.

We have greatly needed a compendious history of Prussia for the period covered by the volume. The complicated course of events involved in the period and the unsystematized condition of the abundant material, made the task of writing one of great difficulty. The aim of Prof. Tuttle has been to trace "the development of the constitution," rather than the various wars, treaties, and dynastic intrigues and territorial conquests.

Beginning with primitive and mediæval Brandenburg, he has sketched its early institutions and society, the rise of the Hohenzollerns and the course of chief events in the 17th century to the Peace of Westphalia closing the Thirty Years' War. Then follows the account of the country under the "Great Elector," Frederick William, the acquisition of the Crown by Frederick III. as Frederick I., the early years of the new kingdom, the foreign policy and administrative reforms of Frederick William I., with a closing chapter on the social and domestic relations under the second king, to the accession of Frederick the Great.

Prof. Tuttle has succeeded well in outlining the development of Prussia, and has made a volume that will greatly aid the student in getting a clear conception of it. A point of some weakness in Prof. Tuttle's effort to trace the development, appears in a failure to grasp the full bearing of the religious forces that wrought in the Reformation and through the Thirty Years' War. But the work is meritorious, and deserves to be welcomed.

*The Longfellow Birthday Book.* Arranged by Charlotte Fiske Bates. pp. 398.

Longfellow is ineffably precious in whatever form he is presented to us.

While in these broken passages from his immortal productions we lose the satisfaction derived from reading a piece through to the end, there are few authors whose fragments are in themselves so exquisite as Longfellow's. A single stanza, a line or two caught at a hasty glance will often keep ringing in one's ear for whole days. For under each day of the year the author has put several passages from his prose and poetry, and on the opposite page are found the names of distinguished persons born on these days. If there be anything but cream in Longfellow, Miss Bates may be said to offer the cream on these pages. The volume is superbly bound and contains beautiful illustrations, among them a striking portrait of the author as frontispiece.

PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, PHILA.

*Half Hours with the Lessons of 1884.* Chapters on the Bible Texts chosen for Sabbath-school Study during 1884 in connection with the International Lesson Series by twenty-four Presbyterian Clergymen. pp. 408.

Here we have forty-eight brief, clear and practical discourses from twenty-four distinguished Presbyterian divines on the series of the Sunday-school lessons for the current year. We regret that we do not have a similar series of expositions by Lutheran clergymen, but in the absence of that we can cordially recommend these admirable discussions by our Presbyterian brethren. The quality of the work may be inferred from the names of those who have furnished it, to wit, Dr. Hall, Dr. Crosby, Dr. Cuyler, Dr. Kittredge, Dr. Niccolls, &c., &c., men who almost without exception are everywhere recognized as the most eminent preachers of the Presbyterian Communion. There may be occasional divergence from Lutheran doctrine, as for instance, when Dr. Kittredge on the Conversion of Lydia takes pains to state that not the words of the Gospel uttered by Paul opened the heart of Lydia, but "God *had* opened her heart by his Spirit." Lutherans hold, with the Scriptures, that faith cometh by hearing, and that the word of God serves the Holy Ghost as an instrument for knocking at the closed door of the sinner's heart. As a rule, however, these *Half-Hours* are to be commended as an invaluable help to the full understanding of the Scriptures which constitute the international selections for 1884.

CONCORDIA PUBLICATION HOUSE, ST. LOUIS.

*Passionspredigten.* Von G. Stöckhardt, Pastor an der evang.-luth. Kirche zum heiligen Kreuz, St. Louis, Mo.

This is a series of eighteen sermons on the first half of the history of our Saviour's passion, by Rev. G. Stöckhardt, pastor of the Evang. Lutheran church of the Holy Cross, St. Louis, Mo.

These discourses exhibit considerable skill in deducing appropriate and exhaustive themes from the successive sections of the passion-history, and their homiletic treatment is in the main commendable.

The writer's principal fault, exegetically, is one which, in his preface, he claims to have purposely guarded against, viz., the tendency to excessive

spiritualizing. Take, as an instance, the treatment of the simple fact of our Saviour's passing over the brook Kedron. This is represented as profoundly significant. The stream (Kedron, dark, turbid), was defiled by the blood of the sacrificial victims in the temple, as it had been long before by the ashes of the idols burnt by Hezekiah and Josiah; and now Jesus passed through this stream and took upon himself the burden of the sins and abominable idolatries of all the world. This passage of Kedron was pre-figured by David's crossing it in his flight from Absalom; the analogy being carried out with great minuteness. Also, it echoed the experiences of the Psalmist, Psalm 90: 1: "Save me, O God, for the waters are come into my soul." And also as vivifying the prediction, Ps. 110: 7: "He shall drink of the brook in the way." Also, as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, 3: 2: "I will gather all nations and bring them down to the valley of Jehoshaphat," &c., p. 6.

We regret, moreover, to see the bitterness of the Missouri spirit revealing itself in denunciations of "so-called Lutherans, who are the bitterest enemies of the old pure doctrine," "notorious Judases that have gone out from us and now defame and abuse their former brethren in the faith, public traitors and slaves to vice, who, if they do not ridicule the truth, yet do it harm and give the enemy occasion to revile," p. 65.

A more amiable style would be more suitable for passion-week.

C. A. H.

PORTER & COATES, PHILADELPHIA.

*Luther and the Reformation: The Life-Springs of Our Liberties.* By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. pp. 206.

"Luther and the Reformation" is the memorial oration of Dr. Seiss on Luther, delivered in New York, Nov. 10th, 1883, and "The Life-Springs of our Liberties" is the subject of his discourses delivered in Philadelphia at the Bi-centennial of the founding of Pennsylvania. Although on two different subjects, presented on two different occasions, the connection between the two parts is fully close enough to justify the publication of them in one volume. They are characterized by all the clearness and eloquence for which Dr. Seiss is so well known, and together they exhibit the true sources of our religious and civil liberty. There is here an appreciation of character, a grasp of thought, and a presentation of salient and vital points that will be found attractive and refreshing.

BROBST DIEHL & CO., ALLENTOWN, PA.

*Martin Luther.* A Memorial volume for Schools and Families. By Enoch Smith. pp. 142.

Here is another volume called forth by the Luther quarto-centenary celebration. It is intended for schools and families and is admirably adapted for them. Though given in a small compass, the author has shown rare skill in presenting Luther's life with a fulness of detail that will prove as satisfactory as many a larger work. We can heartily recommend it.

VOL. XIV. No. 2.

A. S. BARNES & CO., NEW YORK AND CHICAGO.

*First Spanish Book.* By James H. Worman, A. M., Ph D., and H. M. Monsanto, B. A. pp. 96.

Prof. Worman, of Vanderbilt University, is the author of a series of modern language readers for schools and home instruction, after the natural or what is termed the Pestalozzian method. This is his first Spanish reader, prepared with manifest care and judgment and published in a most attractive form. He was assisted by H. M. Monsanto, B. A., Professor of Modern Languages in Packard's Business College, New York.

PHILLIPS & HUNT, NEW YORK.

*A Critical History of Philosophy.* By Rev. Asa Mahan, D. D., LL. D., Author of "The Science of Intellectual Philosophy," "The System of Mental Philosophy," "The Science of Logic," "The Science of Natural Theology," etc. In two volumes. pp. 431 and 435. 1883.

The preparation and publication of these fine volumes seem to be due to an influence from Gettysburg. The author's preface states that more than twenty years ago a distinguished German scholar, then president of the leading Lutheran College in the U. S., after having read "The Science of Intellectual Philosophy" with its statements of the different Philosophical Systems in the past, remarked that "President Mahan ought to write a History of Philosophy," adding as a reason: "He *understands* the diverse systems which the History of Philosophy presents to our regard," and this led to the conception and execution of this History. The encouraging words of Dr. H. L. Baugher seem therefore to have suggested this work. After the work was begun, and the first portion examined, words of approval and encouragement of the design and plan were received from Dr. N. Payne Smith, dean of Canterbury, Drs. E. O. Haven, Leonard Bacon and others.

Dr. Mahan has constructed his History of Philosophy upon a new plan. Instead of simply following the chronological order of succession, he has also classified the various systems, connecting and writing them under critically established principles of philosophy. His endeavor has been not only to give an account of the different philosophies, but to trace their gradual development and enable the reader to judge of their soundness as systems of thought. To carry out this plan he starts with a general introduction which, in fact, is a treatise on the real nature and sphere of Philosophy, and aims to determine the fundamental principles and criteria of knowledge. He marks out the distinction between real knowledge and mere opinions, between universal, self-evident truths and mere assumptions. The fundamental basis on which Dr. Mahan tests the soundness of philosophical systems is that "four, and but four, realities ever have been or by any possibility can be, represented as realities in human thought." These are *Spirit, Matter, Time, and Space*. The validity of our knowledge of these realities is shown from their necessary, direct and universal apprehension by the human mind and the impossibility of displacing them



from thought. On this basis he points out the formation of the four ever-recurring systems of philosophy—Materialism, Idealism, Skepticism, and Realism. He shows the utter error of the first three of these, in their arbitrary disregard of the fundamental principles of immediate and unquestionable knowledge. Realism alone stands as true and required by the rigorous necessities of human thought. This introductory treatise is an excellent example of close, strong, compact philosophical discussion. The facts of direct perception, both external and internal, are kept closely to, the order of thought is logically followed, and the links of the argument made clear—the whole forming a valuable vindication of the intuitional philosophy and the validity of our intuitional knowledge. Occasionally, in the earnestness of writing, Dr. Mahan asserts positions without due qualification. But whatever may be thought of some of these, in their positive form, there can be only admiration of the incisive effectiveness with which he cuts up the errors of materialistic and skeptical systems.

After this introduction, which is meant to kindle a light in which the student can understand and test philosophies, the author traces the history in three parts—I. The Oriental Philosophy, II. The Grecian Philosophy, III. The Christian Evolution in Philosophy. In portions of this Dr. Mahan's success has been somewhat qualified by the necessity of using material at second hand. The field of investigation is too extensive to be traversed except by specialists. This is particularly true of the Oriental systems. And as to these he has allowed himself to depend too much upon an anonymous 'Epitome of the History of Philosophy,' translated from the French in 1842, making too little use of the results of recent research by eminent Sanscrit scholars. In drawing up his summary of the oriental views, he has approached nearer to Christian conceptions than his authorities warrant. We believe that the systems of thought in both India and China show the roots of a primitive monotheism; but it appears to have been much less formal and dogmatic than in our author's way of putting it. In giving the Grecian and Christian philosophies, his success is clearer and the general results are more satisfactory.

Dr. Mahan's aim and method in this elaborate history, while worthy of high commendation, have exposed him to disadvantages and dangers which he has not wholly escaped. The aim has been the noble one of showing how the whole course of philosophic thought vindicates and supports theistic and Christian truth. This is legitimate and worthy of great praise. And beyond all question he has succeeded in the purpose to a very gratifying degree. But the plan—and especially the glowing fervor with which the material is marshaled and the polemic attitude is sustained—tends to bring his impartiality under suspicion. Judicial calmness is a high and assuring quality in a history of philosophy. Everything that awakens the least distrust is damaging. We do not think this plan should be rejected on this account. But it is to be regretted that Dr. Mahan was not more on his guard against polemic *manner* in tone and epithets. As it is, the work

is indeed an able and valuable vindication of theistic truth, a very bracing and helpful study in philosophy, but, if calmer, it would be stronger still and better.

A full index should be added. The absence of this is a serious defect in a work of this kind.

*Irenics.* By James Strong, S. T. D., LL. D., Professor in the Drew Theological Seminary. pp. 215. 1883.

The title of this work is a fair indication of its aim and spirit. It is composed of a series of essays originally prepared as lectures, on the following themes: I. Science and the Bible; II. Nature and the Supernatural; III. The Divine and the Human in Scripture; IV. The Old and the New Testaments; V. Calvinism and Arminianism; VI. Divine Benevolence and Endless Punishment.

One need but look at these subjects to recognize the singular timeliness of the discussion, while the author's well-known ability and learning and the healthy conservatism which marks every page, combine to render it a very satisfactory and valuable work.

Dr. Strong writes with a practical simplicity and lucidity of style. The more glaring and surprising is the complicated sentence on the middle of page 64 which the critic finds unintelligible. So also confusion arises from his definition of "plenary inspiration" as implying a species of omniscience on the part of the sacred writers. The use of that term is uniformly applied to the totality of the Scriptures not to the universality of the knowledge of the writers. The "*rationalistic*" views of inspiration, both those of the "comparatively evangelical school" and those of "the broad class of freethinkers," are effectually demolished.

The point briefly touched by the author, that if the verbal theory of inspiration were true the possession of the genuine word of God must be a privilege accorded to an extremely small number—those namely who read the Autographs, is deserving of much greater attention than it has hitherto received. If the unlettered man does not to-day have the word of God in sufficient purity to warrant him in regarding it as God's unadulterated truth, then the millions who in all ages have depended solely on translations have sustained a grievous misfortune over against the favored few to whom the oracles were originally entrusted. If he on the contrary has God's pure word, then there can be no vital difference between a faithful translation and the inspired original.

*Outlines of the Doctrine of the Resurrection, Biblical, Historical, and Scientific.* by Rev. R. J. Cooke, M. A. With an Introduction by D. D. Whedon, LL. D. pp. 407.

In view of the importance of the doctrine, the literature on the subject of the resurrection is surprisingly meagre. For this reason we give the present volume a welcome all the more hearty. It is an earnest discus-

sion of the question from the standpoint of the resurrection of the identical body that is laid in the grave. It is treated on the different bases indicated above—the biblical, historical and scientific.

Mr. Cooke certainly fulfills the requirement, that a writer should be thoroughly interested in his subject. He is completely absorbed. On account of this he is sometimes led into extravagance of expression, but the reader in sympathy with him will be indulgent and readily overlook it.

The work has so many merits, and is such a full and spirited treatment of the subject, that the few excesses of an unguarded enthusiasm and the diffuseness of some portions should be cheerfully passed by. The article of the creed, "I believe in the resurrection of the body"—the identical body that is buried—receives an emphatic endorsement in this volume, is well sustained on scientific grounds, and is shown to be the faith of the Church down through the centuries, and to be fully supported by the testimony of the Scriptures.

*Commentary on the Old Testament.* Vol. VI. Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song. Book of Job, by J. K. Burr, D. D. Book of Proverbs, by W. Hunter, D. D. Book of Ecclesiastes and Solomon's Song, by A. B. Hyde, D. D. D. D. Whedon, LL. D., Editor. pp. 557. 1881.

This commentary, published under the editorship of Dr. Whedon, proves to be one of much merit. Commentaries are exceedingly abundant these days; and the custom of extemporizing them for the study of the International Sunday-school lessons is giving some volumes of very superficial and temporary value. This work does not belong to this class, but has been planned and conducted upon the idea of furnishing a concise but thorough exegetical commentary, embodying the latest results of sound biblical criticism and research. It is fulfilling this conception to a highly gratifying degree.

In his introduction to Job, Dr. Burr briefly and justly vindicates the historical character of the book and its pre-Mosaic origin against the assaults of recent criticism. The comments are in the line of conservative theology, and are mostly clear and judicious. It seems to us a pity, however, that he has helped to preserve the error which finds in Job's confession (19 : 25-27) a reference to the Messiah and the resurrection of the dead. Dr. Burr has appended an interesting concordance of the passages in the book containing allusions to facts of science and philosophy, arts and social usages in Job's day.

Dr. Hyde summarizes the arguments for and against Solomon's authorship of Ecclesiastes, and thinks the adverse view is gaining ground. It does not, however, affect the canonicity and authority of the book. Its theme is the path to true happiness. In his exposition of the Song of Solomon, the poem is viewed in its literal sense—the allegorical and typical views being thought unsustained. The love between the sexes is some-

thing divine with a divine service, and needs recognition in sanctified literature. "The varied course of antenuptial affection gives a fascination to a sort of literature of which the common mind never wearies. The Scriptures might seem deficient if no appeals were made to us from our susceptibility to the sweet and natural delight of love. Therefore a brief, bright picture is given of an ardent passion finding its rest and consummation." We cannot accept this view of the subject, nor the exegesis that confines the meaning within this limited and, to us, unworthy scope. Along with the old, a new translation is given in metrical form, often bringing out the sense with great beauty and clearness, but making in some places changes that are not improvements.

Taking the volume as a whole it is a valuable addition to our Old Testament exegetical helps.

AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, PHILADELPHIA.

*Struggling Upward.* By Sarah J. Jones, author of "Downward." pp. 279.

"Struggling Upward" is a sequel to "Downward" from the same writer, published sometime ago, and completes the lives of certain characters which were left unfinished in that thrilling volume—Olive, the patient sister, and Fred, the scapegrace, who had disappeared to a western mining camp.

The present work is a touching story of mining camp-life in the far west, written with such graphic power as to bring the dreadful experiences of such a life almost bodily into view. The authoress is quite happy in her illustrations and spirited in her recitals, and remarkably apt and forceful in her quotations from Scripture. The aim of the story is to show how the most depraved may be reclaimed through the remembrance of a mother's prayers and counsels.

*A Christian Home: How to Make and How to Maintain it.* By John Hall, D. D., New York. pp. 250.

This book is marked throughout by Dr. Hall's strong, sound, practical sense. It has been meant to be useful; and its plain, straight-forward discussion of the family constitution according to biblical teaching, and of the practical principles whose observance makes the Christian and happy home, cannot fail to make helpful and lasting impressions on the reader. It ought to be in every Sunday-school library, and be read by all the young. Every family should have a copy.

JANSEN, M'CLURG & CO., CHICAGO.

*Times of Charles XII.* By S. Topelius. Translated from the original Swedish. pp. 349. 1884.

This Third Cycle of the Surgeon's Stories fully sustains the high standard of the previous volumes. In the marvelous career of the great Swedish Soldier—at whose name "the world grew pale," there was such a bewildering heroism in actual life, that the author has little occasion to tax

his imagination for the creation of thrilling scenes. The element of fiction falls accordingly into the back ground. We are sorry to find again the introduction of a fatal ring, the loss of which was coincident with the beginning of the disasters that overwhelmed the King and his unhappy country. Such mad projects as those of Charles XII. require no fate of magic charm to fix their end in dire ruin.

SEVERINGHAUS & CO., CHICAGO.

*Formelbuch für Deutsche Prediger und Gemeinden* der General Synode der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten von America. Eine Sammlung von liturgischen und Kirchenregimentlichen Formeln, Organisationsregeln der deutschen Publikationsbehörde. Zweite, umgearbeitete Auflage. pp. 132.

The second edition of this excellent German collection of Forms of church service was published in 1881. Now it has been enlarged by the addition of English forms for the Order of Public Worship, Baptism, Confirmation, Installation of Church Council, The Preparatory Service, The Holy Communion, &c., &c. This edition has accordingly especial value for Pastors who have occasion to officiate in both languages.

#### PAMPHLETS.

*An Address delivered before the Northumberland County Teachers' Institute.* By Rev. W. H. Gotwald.

*Verhandlungen der 25ten Jahresversammlung des Mittleren Distrikts der deutschen Evang.-Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und andern Staaten,* versammelt in Cleveland, O. Aug. 1-7, 1883. pp. 98.

*My Saint John.* By James M. Ludlow. Funk & Wagnalls.

#### HARPER'S PERIODICALS.

*Harper's Monthly, Harper's Weekly, Harper's Bazar, and Harper's Young People* continue to come regularly. They are unsurpassed in their respective spheres, and will hold their readers as long as they maintain their present high standard. They are first-class periodicals, and will delight every intelligent family. We heartily recommend them.

The following works have been received :

FROM FUNK & WAGNALLS, NEW YORK.

*Thirty Thousand Thoughts*, being extracts covering a comprehensive circle of religious and allied topics. Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M. A., Rev. Joseph S. Exell, M. A., Rev. Charles Neil, M. A. Large Octavo. pp. 539.

FROM HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON.

*An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church.*  
By Henry C. Lea. Second Edition, Enlarged. Large Octavo. pp. 682.

FROM AMERICAN S. S. UNION, PHILADELPHIA.

*Scholars' Handbook on the International Lessons.* Second Series—fifth  
year. By Rev. Edwin W. Rice. pp. 194.

*The International Daily Text Book.* Vest Pocket Edition.

#### TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

As usual on the *first of April*, we sent to our subscribers a statement of their respective indebtedness. We ask their special attention to our bill, and request an early remittance. There has been unusual negligence, during the last year, on the part of many, and we have been subjected to great inconvenience on account of it. Let there be a prompt and general response.

Address

PROF. P. M. BIKLE,

GETTYSBURG, PA.